MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOODSERVICE MANAGERS

by

PAIGE MITCHELL SULTEMEIER

B.S., Texas Tech University, 1983

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management, and Dietetics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1988

Approved by:

Mary B. Gregoire
Major Professor

A11208 130591

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A great sense of achievement accompanies completing a long term goal. Such was the case for me by finishing a master's degree which included writing this thesis.

Several individuals have provided a great deal of assistance along the way, and this is my opportunity to express my sincere gratitude. John Pence played an important role by presenting the research proposal to the National Association of College and University Food Service's (NACUFS) Executive Board. Without the endorsement and funding from NACUFS, this project would have been impossible.

Dr. Mary Gregoire was a superb Research Committee Chairperson. She provided expert guidance throughout the research and writing process, which made me appreciate her professionalism, knowledge, and patience. The writing and editing skills of Dr. Marion Spears are beyond comparison. She revised wording and phrases to smooth the "rough edges." Dr. Ronald Downey provided the statistical expertise to the project; never too busy to make time for discussing research data and results. I am grateful for their assistance and words of encouragement.

To the professional staff of the Residence Hall Foodservice, I offer my genuine thanks for providing support, as well as, friendship during my four years at Kansas State. It has been a great pleasure to work with individuals who exhibit high standards for themselves and the institution they manage. Nedra Sylvis has a remarkable

reputation as a skilled typist. While typing this final draft, she detected several errors. Mrs. Sylvis has added yet another graduate to her fan club.

Special thanks to my family, especially my parents, for their continued love and reassurance. The importance of education was a value instilled at a young age, therefore achievement of this goal--completion of a higher educational degree--should be greatly attributed to my father and mother.

Chris, my husband and friend, has been a source of encouragement, patience, and undying love. In many ways, this project was a joint effort. He stuffed his share of envelopes, licked stamps, and carried survey packets by the armload into the post office. We are both thrilled and relieved to have completed "my" thesis and master's degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
Managerial Functions and Skills	3
Management functions	3
Skills of managers	4
Managerial Roles and Effect of Organizational Level	5
Activities and roles	5
Managerial levels	7
Mintzberg's Role Theory	11
Mintzberg's study	11
Studies based on Mintzberg's work	13
Studies of College and University Foodservice Managers	21
METHODOLOGY	24
Identification of Sample	24
Project Endorsement	25
Questionnaire Development	25
Distribution of Questionnaire	27
Data Analysis	29
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	31
Description of the Sample	31
Analysis of Importance and Time Demand Ratings	36

Page

Importance of managerial activities 36

Mean importance ratings 37

Time demand of managerial activities 40

Mean ratings for time demand 41

Analysis of Managerial Roles 45

Categorization of activities into roles 45

Correlation of importance and time demand role scores 48

Analysis of mean importance and time demand role scores 50

Importance role scores 53

Time demand role scores 56

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 60

Summary 60

Sample 61

Development and distribution of the research instrument 61

Characteristics of the college and university foodservice managers 62

Analysis of ratings of managerial activities 63

Conclusions 64

REFERENCES 67

APPENDIXES 71

A. Initial Correspondence and Sample Identification Inquiry to Foodservice Directors 72

B. Follow-up Letter to Initial Mailing 75

C. Letter to NACUFS' President 77

Page

D. Letter to NACUFS' Executive Board 79

E. Endorsement Letter from NACUFS' President 83

F. Palacio Questionnaire Revisions for this Study 85

G. Final Survey Instrument 93

H. Letter to Directors Explaining Study
Correspondence Letters to Directors and Managers . . 98

I. Position Titles of College and University
Foodservice Managers 105

J. Supplemental Tables 108

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Demographic profile of managers in college and university foodservice	32
2.	Employment profile of college and university foodservice managers	34
3.	Importance ratings of managerial activities by three groups of college and university foodservice managers	37
4.	Importance for activities rated essential by three groups of college and university foodservice managers	39
5.	Time demand ratings of managerial activities by three groups of college and university foodservice managers	41
6.	Mean time demand for activities rated weekly or more by three groups of college and university foodservice managers	42
7.	Reliability of scores on importance from ratings of activity statements	46
8.	Reliability of scores on time demand from ratings of activity statements	47
9.	Correlation coefficients for importance role scores	49
10.	Correlation coefficients for time demand role scores	51
11.	Correlation coefficients for importance and time demand role scores	52
12.	Comparison of mean scores from importance ratings categorized by managerial group	54
13.	Comparison of mean scores from importance ratings categorized by education level	55
14.	Comparison of mean scores from time demand ratings categorized by managerial group	57

Table Page

15. Comparison of mean scores from time demand ratings categorized by education level 59

16. Development of research questionnaire based on statements from the Palacio study 86

17. Group 1 college and university foodservice manager ratings on importance of activity statements 109

18. Group 2 college and university foodservice manager ratings on importance of activity statements 113

19. Group 3 college and university foodservice manager ratings on importance of activity statements 117

20. Group 1 college and university foodservice manager ratings on time demand of activity statements 121

21. Group 2 college and university foodservice manager ratings on time demand of activity statements 125

22. Group 3 college and university foodservice manager ratings on time demand of activity statements 129

23. Questionnaire activity statements categorized into Mintzberg's managerial roles 133

INTRODUCTION

Knowledgeable, experienced individuals are needed in college and university foodservice management (1). Boyatzis (2) stated that organizations need competent foodservice managers to ensure resources are managed in an efficient and effective manner. Erffmeyer (3) contended college and university foodservice directors are faced with decreasing student enrollments, noncompulsory meal and housing plans, and increasing competition from franchise food operations.

Coping with the demands of a nutritionally aware population, as well as, mandatory budget cuts, and increased food and labor costs has been a great challenge to college and university foodservice managers. Managers need skills to deal with foodservice operational problems, new technology, and the challenge of raising low levels of productivity (4).

Henry Mintzberg (5) conceived the role theory of management in his book entitled The Nature of Managerial Work. Mintzberg identified ten roles that all managers assume regardless of their position and grouped them as interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles. Interpersonal roles include figurehead, leader, and liaison and are derived directly from the authority and status associated with holding managerial office. The second set of managerial activities, informational roles relate primarily to the processing of information in which managers act as the focal point in the organization for the movement of nonroutine information. Disseminator, monitor, and spokesman roles are informational roles. Entrepreneur, resource

allocator, disturbance handler, and negotiator are decisional roles which describe a manager's control over the strategy-making system in the organization.

Few studies have been conducted applying Mintzberg's work to foodservice managment. Palacio et al. (6) examined managerial roles of professional staff in hospital dietetic services at different organizational levels and in administrative and clinical practice.

Research on roles of managers in college and university foodservice is sparse. This study was designed to extend research to this very important area of foodservice management. The purpose of this study was to examine roles of college and university foodservice managers at different organizational levels. Specific objectives of the study were to:

- determine perceived importance of various managerial activities;
- determine perceived time required for managerial activities;
- compare perceived importance of ten managerial roles by three hierarchial levels of managers; and
- compare perceived time required for ten managerial roles by three hierarchial levels of managers.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Managerial Functions and Skills

Management functions

In 1916, Fayol (7) divided the management process into five parts: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. He believed planning was the most important and difficult managerial responsibility.

Gulick (8) continued work in the field of managerial functions and gave managers one of their early acronyms POSDCORB; planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. According to Gulick, planning is working out in broad outline tasks that need to be accomplished and methods for doing them to meet the goals of the enterprise. Organizing is establishment of a formal authority structure through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated to meet objectives. Staffing is the entire personnel function of employing and training staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work. Directing is the continuous task of making decisions, embodying them in orders and instructions, and serving as leader. Coordinating involves interrelating various parts of the work. Reporting is informing the superiors or the responsible executive concerning activities. Budgeting includes fiscal planning, accounting and controlling.

Barnard (9) classified executive functions under three headings; maintenance of organizational communications, obtainment of essential

services from individuals, and formulation of purpose and objectives. Drucker (10) included actuating and innovating, which involve accomplishing work through others and initiating new and creative ideas.

Terry (11) added delegation to the managerial functions and defined it as the function of passing authority and responsibility to lower levels. Mahoney et al. (12) reported managerial time can be allocated to eight basic managerial functions called "PRINCESS" factors: planning, representing, investigating, negotiating, coordinating, evaluating, supervising, and staffing.

Strong (13) stated managers plan, organize, motivate, direct and control the six M's: men, money, materials, machinery, markets, and minutes. He also proposed managers add foresight, order, purpose, integration of effort, and effectiveness to the contributions of others. Katz and Rosenzweig (14) defined controlling as that phase of the managerial process involved with maintaining organizational activity within allowable limits.

Skills of managers

Katz (15) identified three basic skills needed by managers; technical, human, and conceptual. He stated every successful manager must have varying degrees of each skill, according to the level of management. Technical skill implies an understanding of, and proficiency in, a specific kind of activity, especially one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Technical skill has greatest importance at lower levels of administration. Human skill

is ability and judgment in working with and through people, including an understanding of motivation and an application of effective leadership, and is needed for managers at all levels but is most important at low levels. Conceptual skill involves the ability to see the enterprise as a whole, understand complexities of the overall organization, and realize the placement of one's own operation. Conceptual skill is most important at higher levels of management.

In Katz's (16) retrospective commentary on his original article of twenty years before, he stood by his original statement that effective administration was based on three skills. Katz refined the idea of human skills by identifying two types: intragroup and leadership. He also indicated conceptual skill was an inborn ability, not one that could be taught or learned.

Managerial Roles and Effects of Organizational Level

Activities and roles

Shartle (17) described seven activities performed by executives: inspection of the organization, investigation, research, preparation planning of procedures and methods, coordination, evaluation, and interpretation of plans and procedures. Seven additional executive activities included supervision of technical operations, personnel activities, public relations, professional consultation, negotiations, schedules, and professional operations.

Sarbin and Allen (18) defined role as an organized set of behaviors belonging to an identifiable position. Individual

personality may affect how a role is performed but not if it is performed.

Mintzberg (5) stated that earlier studies had failed to delineate what managers actually do. In his structured study of five chief executive officers, Mintzberg attempted to give insight into what managers do. Mintzberg determined that managerial activities may be divided into ten roles in three categories: three interpersonal, three informational, and four decisional roles.

Choran (19) used structured observation to study the work of presidents of three small firms. He concluded company presidents performed all ten roles identified by Mintzberg, but varied in amount of attention given each role.

McCall et al. (20) summarized studies on managerial activities and roles using diaries and observational methods for data collection. The results indicated a manager's job is fragmented, and often at a pace that is staggering and constant. McCall et al. suggested the 10 roles proposed by Mintzberg justified further study.

Frohman (21) conducted a study of research and development managers and hypothesized that five managerial roles were performed by these managers; gatekeeping, idea generating, championing, project leading, and coaching. His findings indicated individuals tended to perform one or two managerial roles well rather than performing all equally well.

Managerial levels

Barnard (9) divided management activities into three areas: maintaining organizational communication, securing essential services from individuals, and formulating purposes and objectives. He stated objectives differ by managerial level but become more specific at the level where the work is actually done. According to Barnard, each lower level in the management hierarchy translates higher level policy into a more operational form.

Niles (22) in her study of middle managers asserted the primary task of middle management consisted of carrying out policies of top management so as to maintain a well-coordinated and efficient organization. Martin (23) studied by observation, interview, and examination of correspondence, the decision situation encountered at four management levels (works manager, division superintendent, department foreman, and shift foreman). Manager's jobs at lower levels were found to be more oriented toward specific current issues, which concentrated on a narrow range, spanning a shorter period of time. Higher level managers were characterized by longer time horizons and duration, greater discontinuity, more elastic time limits, more abstract data and casual relationships, and greater uncertainty.

Pfiffner and Sherwood (24) reported first level supervisors work under considerable time pressure and have frequent and direct personal contact with the work. These features were found to be less characteristic of second level and higher level managers.

Sayles (25) studied lower and middle level managers and described their work as primarily maintenance of external work flows, including routine work relationships such as, purchasing and selling. Katz and Kahn (26) studied lower and middle level managers and defined three types of leader behavior: introduction of structural change, or policy formation; interpolation or the piecing out of existing formal structure; and use of formal structure provided to keep the organization in motion and effective operation. They found only top echelons of line and staff officers are really in a position to introduce changes in structure. The piecing out of structure was found most often in the middle levels of the organization. The lowest supervisory level was involved mainly in exercising leadership by skillful use of existing structure.

Klahr and Leavitt (27) established tasks flow through the organization by entering at the top in ill-defined, new forms. Top level management revise, define, and initiate tasks. If tasks are to continue, they are passed down the hierarchy, where they had been converted from partially operational states into highly defined steps. The basic concept consists of ill-defined tasks for top management and well-defined for bottom management.

Nealey and Fiedler (28) studied leadership functions at different hierarchial levels in actual organizations and found they seldom had the "clean" shape of the neatly drawn organization charts in textbooks. Defining a manager's organizational level was frequently more complex than just counting upward from the bottom of the organization. Boundaries of people in activities and organizational positions often

did not coincide. Split positions, in which two persons perform jointly one set of functions, and cases, in which a manager functions concurrently at two or even three supervisory levels called dual or multiple positions, were often found in organizations. Organizational size and shape, technology, and line versus staff differences, as well as the incidence of multiple and split positions tend to mitigate the extent to which a given supervisory level has common characteristics across situations.

Nealey and Fielder (28) questioned the concept that successful first level supervisors would become highly effective second level managers and supported the hypothesis that different organizational levels place somewhat different demands on leaders. Katz and Kahn (29) asserted that the top, middle, and first level managers perform substantially different patterns of leadership functions in the organization and have different cognitive styles, degrees and types of knowledge, and affective characteristics.

Alexander (30) studied 225 managers to examine effect of manager's hierarchial level and functional area on the extent Mintzberg's managerial roles are required by managerial jobs. Results of the study indicated manager's hierarchial level had a strong effect on the extent managerial roles were required. Six managerial roles were required to a greater extent as one moved up the hierarchy.

Paolillo (31) conducted a study which systematically assessed various roles essential to managers on different levels of the managerial hierarchy. Results indicated seven of Mintzberg's ten roles were influenced by hierarchial level.

Pavett and Lau (32) studied 180 managers and executives representing a wide variety of private sector service and manufacturing firms. The study examined influence of hierarchial level and functional specialty on managerial roles and required skills, knowledge, and abilities. Results of questionnaire responses indicated hierarchial level contributes to differences in rated importance of managerial roles and skills.

Palacio et al. (6) studied the effect of organizational level and practice area on managerial activities and roles of professional staff in hospital dietetic services. Perceived importance of managerial activities tended to be greater at higher organizational levels. The managerial aspects of the lower clinical and upper administrative position were the most clearly defined. The lower clinical group tended to rate all managerial roles as significantly less important than did those in other positions; however, the middle clinical position included substantial managerial responsibilities.

Hughes and Singler (33) surveyed 700 managers about the relative importance of various functional areas to first line, second line, and general marketing managers. Results indicated importance of directing, controlling, and organizing were fairly constant from one level to another. However, importance of planning increased and importance of staffing decreased, as managers progressed from first level to top management.

Mintzberg's Role Theory

Minzberg's study

Mintzberg (34-36) conducted research to find what managers actually do. Using a method called "structured observation," Mintzberg observed for one week periods the chief executives of five medium to large organizations (a consulting firm, a school system, a technology firm, a consumer goods manufacturer, and a hospital). Structured and unstructured data were collected in three records: chronology, mail, and contact records. The chronology record included activity patterns throughout the working day. Purpose, format, sender, attention received, and action elicited constituted the mail record for 890 pieces of mail processed during five weeks. The contact record included for each of 368 verbal interactions the purpose, medium, participants, form of initiation, and location. Ten roles or organized sets of behaviors were chosen to capture all activities observed during the study.

All roles were found to involve one or more of three basic behaviors: interpersonal contact, information processing, and decision making. As a result, the ten roles were grouped into one of the three behaviors (34-36).

Three roles dealing with behavior essentially interpersonal in nature were figurehead, liaison, and leader. In the figurehead role, managers perform some duties of a ceremonial nature. The leader role involves managers establishing the work atmosphere within an organization and activating subordinates to achieve organizational goals. In

the liaison role, the manager by virtue of his authority and associated status is able to develop a special kind of external linkage system to obtain information and cooperation (34-36).

Managerial activities related primarily to the processing of information and included monitor, disseminator, and spokesman. In the role of monitor, managers seek information to detect changes, identify problems and opportunities, build up knowledge, and be informed when information must be disseminated and decisions made. As a disseminator, managers send external information into the organization and internal information from one subordinate to another. In the spokesman role, the manager transmits information to the organization's environment and public. The manager is required to keep informed about the organization's plans, policies, and results. The function is to inform the next higher echelon of key influencers; i.e., the chief executive informs the board of directors and the middle manager the boss (34-36).

Managerial roles categorized under decision making are entrepreneur or initiator, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator. In the entrepreneur role, managers act as initiators and designers of much of the controlled change in organizations. As disturbance handler, managers deal with involuntary situations and changes that are partially beyond the manager's control. The resource allocator role involves making decisions concerning priorities for utilization of organizational resources. In the negotiator role, managers deal with individuals or other organizations (34-36).

Mintzberg (34-36) found the ten, basic roles form an integrated

whole from which no role can be removed without significantly affecting the remainder. All roles are relevant for any manager or administrator, although their relative importance may vary from one manager to another. Manager's roles are largely predetermined by the nature of a position, but can be interpreted differently while being carried out.

Studies based on Mintzberg's work

Tornow and Pinto (37) conducted a study measuring work content using the Management Position Description Questionnaire (MPDQ). The questionnaire included 208 behavior statements about position activities, general responsibilities, positions demands and restriction, and miscellaneous position characteristics. The importance and frequency of occurrence of activities were measured in the MPDQ. Results of the study indicated 433 managers identified 13 independent job factors which supported Mintzberg's findings.

Whitely (38) conducted a study which attempted to replicate, supplement, and extend Mintzberg's findings. Time sampling and measurement by questionnaire of work characteristics and content were utilized to obtain a fuller description of manager's work. He found the major part of most managers' contact time was spent in transmitting and receiving information verbally, which supported Mintzberg's findings.

Morse and Wagner (39) developed an instrument to measure and evaluate managerial behavior which results in effective managerial performance. A three phase process was utilized to develop the

research instrument. The item statements clustered around managerial roles based on, but slightly different from, the common set of roles identified by Mintzberg. A 51-statement, six role instrument was developed. The six role factors included; managing the organization's environment and its resources, organizing and coordinating, handling information, providing for growth and development, motivating and conflict handling, and solving strategic problems. The questionnaire was administered to managers in two organizations: a data processing firm and a manufacturing company. Results indicated managerial effectiveness correlated significantly with activity content, but the most essential roles were dissimilar in the two companies. The authors determined none of the managerial roles should be negated, and that a manager's effectiveness depends on how well the most important roles for that managerial job or organization were completed.

Alexander (30) studied 225 managers to examine the effect of manager's hierarchial level and functional area on the extent Mintzberg's roles were required by managerial jobs. Each of Mintzberg's ten managerial roles were incorporated in the questionnaire by naming, defining and explaining the role, and giving examples of common activities found in the role. Five point Likert scales were employed to indicate the extent each role was required by the manager. The sample included top, middle, and lower levels of management, interacting with three functional areas--production/manufacturing, sales/marketing, and accounting/finance. Results of the study indicated, manager's hierarchial level and functional area had a strong effect on the extent managerial roles were required. Six

managerial roles including monitor, disseminator, spokesman, figurehead, liaison, and entrepreneur were required to a greater extent as one moved up the hierarchy. No roles were required to a lesser extent as one moved up the managerial hierarchy. No significant overall differences existed between top, middle, and lower level management for leader, disturbance handler, and resource allocator roles. Functional area also had a strong effect on the extent Mintzberg's three role groups were required.

McCall and Segrist (40) extended Mintzberg's study by using his framework of roles and rich descriptions of managerial activities to develop a survey instrument. The validated questionnaire was used to study the relationship of each managerial role to level and function. A total of 2609 managers from eight different functions and six hierarchial levels of a large manufacturing organization completed the 75 item questionnaire. Managers were asked to rate on a seven point scale each activity's importance to their own supervisory performance. Based on correlations between items and factors, eight factors were extracted. Factors one and two were described as leader, factors three and four as liaison, and factors five, six, seven, and eight as monitor, spokesman, entrepreneur, and resource allocator factors. The authors contended four of Mintzberg's ten roles (figurehead, disseminator, disturbance handler, and negotiator) possibly highly correlated and overlapped with other roles or activities. The ranked importance of the roles were generally consistent across levels and functions, supporting Mintzberg's notion that managerial jobs are basically alike.

Snyder and Glueck (41) replicated Mintzberg's study to determine the extent to which managers plan and the importance of planning to management. Mintzberg (35) concluded managers do not plan and that planning is only an objective of managerial work, not an integrated part of the work itself. Using Mintzberg's methodology, Snyder and Glueck observed a school superintendent and a hospital administrator for four days each. The authors indicated that Mintzberg's observational method recorded individual activities one at a time. Mintzberg did not attempt to relate the individual into group activities. Snyder and Glueck considered Mintzberg's observational method to be deficient and supplemented it with interviews. Results of their study indicated that managers do plan, which contradicted Mintzberg's earlier conclusion.

Lau et al. (42) conducted a study in which managerial jobs in public and private operations were compared. Methods included interviews, observations, work activity diaries, and structured questionnaires containing 50 items based on Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles. A total of 210 civilian managers of the United States Navy and 220 managers from private sector firms completed the questionnaire. Results of the study indicated managers in both public and private sectors were similar, but not identical, in their description of job content. Instead of Mintzberg's ten roles, however, they considered four factors to describe managerial work: leadership and supervision, information gathering and dissemination, technical problem solving, and executive decision making--planning--resource allocation.

Shapira and Dunbar (43) conducted an in-basket exercise to test

Mintzberg's managerial role classification. The study's objectives were to determine if research subjects assumed specific managerial roles. Subjects participating included 54 Masters of Business Administration students and 112 managers. Results of the study indicated the 10 managerial roles could be divided into two categories, information and decision, rather than three as proposed by Mintzberg.

The purpose of the study by Snyder and Wheelen (44) was to extend Mintzberg's work by examining role involvement of two chief executives, a school superintendent and hospital administrator. A partial replication of Mintzberg's research was conducted and each chief executive was observed for four working days. Each separate and distinct activity in which the executive engaged, the duration, and purpose of each activity was recorded following Mintzberg's classification scheme and methods. One difficulty found in applying Mintzberg's scheme was the impossibility of placing many activities into one and only one role group; Mintzberg's role categories are not mutually exclusive. Results indicated Mintzberg's role theory and process theory are quite similar, however, the authors stated a need for greater clarity, more specific activities on the management functions, and more clarification in the relationship between the role involvement of managers and organizational effectiveness.

Paolillo (31) surveyed 352 managers representing a variety of manufacturing, service, retail, and government organizations. A questionnaire was designed to include questions for top, middle, and lower level managers. Each respondent indicated the importance of each of Mintzberg's ten managerial roles in the effective performance

of their present jobs using a five point Likert scale. Results indicated manager's hierarchial level had a substantial influence on extent to which Mintzberg's managerial roles were required. The most important of the ten roles to high level managers was the monitor role. The figurehead, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, resource allocator, and negotiator roles appeared to be more indicative of top level managers than middle or low level managers. The disturbance handler role was of lesser importance to top level managers. The leadership role was most indicative of middle level than high or low level managers. Of lesser importance to middle level managers were the spokesperson, disturbance handler, and disseminator roles. The liaison and disturbance handler roles were more indicative of low level than high or middle level managers. The negotiator role was less important to the low level manager than the other two hierarchial levels.

Bright (45) conducted a study to investigate effect of differences in personality types on extent to which managerial roles are emphasized by practicing managers. Mintzberg's descriptions of managerial activities were used to evaluate the influence of the personal variable on the manager's job. A standard personality instrument was used to survey 90 practicing managers. This study supported Mintzberg's finding that managers play ten managerial roles but with different emphases and gave general support to the contingency idea that work of a manager varies according to personality but the effect is limited.

Pavett and Lau (32) extended Mintzberg's work by examining the

influence of hierarchial level and functional specialty on managerial roles and required skills, knowledge, and abilities. Pavett and Lau hypothesized that lower level managers would perceive roles of disturbance handler, negotiator, and leader as more important than would upper level managers. Also, that significant differences would be found among functional specialties on perceptions of role requirements. A total of 180 managers representing three hierarchial levels and six functional areas were studied. The survey instrument contained 54 items, which measured perceived success, and 30 items for measuring perceived importance of managerial skills to successful job performance. With the use of principal component analysis, 11 factors were extracted, seven of which clearly represented Mintzberg's roles.

Results of Pavett and Lau's (32) study indicated hierarchial level contributed to differences in rated importance of managerial roles. Lower level managers rated leadership as more important for successful job performance than top or middle level managers. Relative importance of managerial roles was similar across all three levels, which supports Mintzberg's contentions and provides evidence that managers at all levels perform similar roles but with different emphases. Functional area influenced perceived importance of managerial skills. The authors contend their results support the contingency theory that a common set of roles are performed by managers; and effective managers behave differently in different situations.

Kurke and Aldrich (46) completed a replication of Mintzberg's study by observing four chief executive officers of a public hospital,

a school system, a high technology manufacturing firm, and a bank for one working week each. Structured observation with supplemental unstructured interviewing was used to study the chief executive officers. Mintzberg's field study was supported by the replication in all important dimensions.

Palacio et al. (6) conducted a study to determine effect of organizational level and practice area on managerial activities and roles of professional staff in hospital dietetic services. A nationwide sample of 3280 dietetic professionals in hospitals with 300+ beds participated. Five groups were defined: low administrative, low clinical, middle administrative, middle clinical, and upper administrative. Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles were used as the basis for developing an 80 item instrument on which respondents rated each item for importance and time demand.

Results of the Palacio et al. (6) study revealed perceived importance of managerial activities tended to be greater at higher organizational levels. The managerial aspects of lower clinical and upper administrative position were most clearly defined. A frequency distribution was compiled for groups defined by organizational level and practice area according to mean ratings for various activities. The mean ratings for almost half of the activities were in the "very important" or "essential" range. Those in lower level administrative positions tended to rate the activities as somewhat less important than did those in mid-level positions; however few of the activities fell in the non-essential category. Mean ratings of time demand indicated few of the activities were performed by any of the groups

more frequently than once a week. The findings suggest that even though the 80 managerial activities become increasingly important in successively higher levels in the organizational hierarchy, importance of an activity does not indicate it will be performed frequently.

Palacio et al. (47) conducted a principal component analysis to determine if items could be conceptualized meaningfully by a smaller number of components capable of accounting for interrelationships. Reliabilities and correlations were computed for the resulting managerial factor scores. Six factors were identified from the importance rating: upper management, interaction with subordinates, outside activities, quality assurance, communication activities, and personnel activities. Similar dimensions were identified from the time-demand ratings. Findings from this analysis suggest that managers in different functional specialties and at various organizational levels tend to vary in their allocation of time and stress different roles. As a person rises on the administrative ladder of responsibility, concentration on extramural affairs and involvement in planning becomes greater, and concern with specific operational problems decreases.

Studies of College and University Foodservice Managers

Prideaux and Shugart (48) conducted a study to determine if a significant relationship existed between acceptance of residence hall food by students and their reaction to the dietitian and the residence hall social director. A questionnaire was presented to 103 of 939

students living in five women's residence halls. Results of the study indicated the better students knew dietitians, the better they accepted residence hall food. Responses suggest significant relationships also exist between student's acceptance of residence hall meals and frequency with which dietitians were seen by students, the dietitian's concern in pleasing residents, and their interest in the students as persons. Acceptance of residence hall food and acquaintance with social directors were unrelated.

Adams and Vaden (49) conducted a study to assess competencies, tasks, and responsibilities of professional staff in college and university foodservice. The sample included foodservice directors employed by a college or university which had a traditional or coordinated undergraduate dietetic program and was a National Association of College and University Foodservices (NACUFS) member school. Foodservice directors from 104 colleges and universities were mailed a four part questionnaire which requested information about the foodservice operations, assessed perceived value of education and work experiences, and examined functional and educational responsibilities of the professional staff. Results indicated major responsibilities of foodservice directors included development of methods to support goals, evaluation of systems, delegation, communication, and preparation of proposals. Three other responsibilities reported by most foodservice directors were concerned with maintenance of professional competency. A total of 14 of 48 functional responsibilities analyzed were performed by professional staff other than the director. Included were personnel, foodservice administration and foodservice

operation-functional responsibilities, and customer service functions.

Mean importance ratings for the functional responsibilities were computed from the director's responses and grouped into three categories: essential, important, and fairly important. A total of 21 of 48 functional responsibilities received ratings by directors as "essential," 19 functions were in the "very important" category, and the remaining eight were considered to be "fairly important." Those considered "essential" were concerned with planning, financial management, evaluation of operations, and delegation (49).

Bowers (50) questioned 49 foodservice professionals about trends they predicted for the college and university foodservice industry in the 1990's. Professionals at college and university campuses located throughout the United States made predictions including: fewer permanent staff members, fewer middle management staff members, greater use of technology, more sophisticated computer systems dealing with every area managed by foodservice professionals, major renovations, and more innovative programs. A concern with costs and profits, more nutritional emphasis in food selection, flexibility in menu choices, multiple-concept/specialty food facilities, updating of physical facilities, marketing, management/training, and matching off-campus offerings were concerns of college and university food-service managers for the future. Bowers (50) stated that the demand on college and university foodservice managers challenges them to be innovators in responding to changing currents.

METHODOLOGY

Identification of Sample

The research sample was drawn from the foodservice management staff of National Association of College and University Food Service (NACUFS) member institutions with a minimum annual budget of $3 million. Names and addresses of 154 college and university foodservice directors meeting this criteria were obtained from the NACUFS National Office.

An initial mailing containing an explanatory letter and a sample identification inquiry was sent to the 154 foodservice directors (Appendix A). The buff colored half page inquiry requested directors to indicate the number of supervisory or managerial personnel on their staff and verify that their annual foodservice budget was $3 million or more. Each college and university was assigned a code number for ease of identification. Organizational charts were also requested from each college and university foodservice director to assist with categorization of managers into one of three groups:

Group 1: Associate/Assistant or Directors of Foodservice

Group 2: Unit Manager

Group 3: Manager/Supervisor; Directly Responsible to Unit Manager

A follow-up letter was sent to foodservice directors who did not respond to the first mailing (Appendix B).

A total of 103 (64.9%) questionnaires and 42 organizational charts were returned. Three foodservices did not have a budget

of $3 million or more and were eliminated from the study. Foodservice managers from the remaining 100 schools became the study sample.

Project Endorsement

A proposal for this research project was presented to the 1986 NACUFS president with a letter (Appendix C) requesting that he explain the research to the NACUFS Executive Board, distribute letters of information to the members, and elicit the Board's support for the project. The president cooperated and presented a letter outlining the study, the budgetary needs, and encouraging member participation (Appendix D) to the 1986 NACUFS Executive Board members at their annual meeting. The NACUFS Board voted to endorse the research project and give partial financial support of $500.

An endorsement letter from the president representing the NACUFS Executive Board (Appendix E) was included in the mailing to each of the 100 foodservice directors. The letter indicated the NACUFS Executive Board endorsed the research project and encouraged foodservice directors and their management staff to participate in the study.

Questionnaire Development

A revised, shortened version of the 80 item questionnaire developed and pretested by Palacio (51) was used for this study. The questionnaire was based on role descriptions categorized into Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles. In an effort to shorten the questionnaire to approximately 50 activity statements and maintain a minimum of four statements for each of the 10 roles, data from the

Palacio study were re-analyzed. Coefficient Alpha was run on the data to determine which, if any, of the 80 activity statements could be eliminated without significantly affecting the reliability of the instrument. A total of 29 activity statements were deleted from the original Palacio questionnaire based on this analysis. Slight wording modification of 20 activity statements also was made. Appendix F contains a list of Palacio's 80 activity statements and a description of items deleted, reworded or left the same for the final research questionnaire. Fifty-one activity statements were included in the final questionnaire and arranged in random order.

The six point relative importance scale from Palacio's (51) questionnaire was revised by combining two points, (6) not part of my job and (5) non-essential, into one. The resulting five point importance scale was used for respondents to indicate the value placed on activity statements in which they were involved, ranging from 1, essential, to 5, not part of my job or non-essential.

Importance
1 = Essential
2 = Very important
3 = Fairly important
4 = Of minor importance
5 = Not part of my job or non-essential

The time demand scale was the one used by Palacio (51) and consisted of six points related to frequency of activity from 1, daily, to 6, not part of my job directly. The scale was as follows:

Time Demand

1 = Daily
2 = Weekly
3 = Once or twice a month
4 = Several times a year
5 = About once a year
6 = Not part of my job directly

A section in demographic information was included at the end of the questionnaire and requested sex, age, education, registration status, employment information, and current position. The questionnaire was printed on a gray four-page booklet (Appendix G).

Distribution of Questionnaire

Each of the 100 college and university foodservice directors, who responded to the inquiry statement, was mailed an announcement letter describing the packet of research materials they would be receiving (Appendix H). Also included in this mailing was the project endorsement letter from the 1986 NACUFS president (Appendix E).

The research materials mailing was sent to participating foodservice directors one week later. The mailing consisted of:

- a cover letter to the foodservice director,
- several manager's packets, and
- one large stamped, addressed return envelope.

In the cover letter, foodservice directors were given instructions for distribution and collection of the questionnaires (Appendix H). Each director was asked to:

- distribute a packet to each manager with a position in one of the three identified groups of management

- complete one of the questionnaires
- collect all completed questionnaires including their own
- return all questionnaires to KSU in the large, self-addressed stamped envelope

Organizational charts were requested in the cover letter from those colleges and university foodservices who had not included an organizational chart in the earlier response.

Each manager received a manager's packet which included a letter (Appendix H) explaining the study and a questionnaire. Managers were instructed to complete the enclosed questionnaire, seal it in the envelope, and return to their foodservice director. The number of manager's packets mailed to each school was based on the foodservice director's response to the number of managers/supervisors in the foodservice requested in an earlier mailing.

A large, self-addressed stamped envelope was included for foodservice directors to return completed questionnaires of participating managers. This procedure, which maintained confidentiality, as well as economy in mailing costs, was used successfully in the Palacio (51) study.

A total of 2120 questionnaires were mailed to the 100 college and university foodservice directors for distribution. Eighty college and university foodservice directors (80.0%) returned 1086 questionnaires from their management staff. Due to the high return rate from colleges and universities, no follow-up mailing was sent.

A new identification number was assigned to each of the college and university foodservices participating in the study. This method

of identification allowed linking of responses from each organization.

Eighty-seven of the questionnaires were disqualified from the study because the manager's title was not in one of the three groups being studied. A total of 999 questionnaires were analyzed for the study. Twenty-five in addition to the originally submitted 42 organizational charts were received to give a total of 67 (67.0%).

Each of the 999 questionnaires was categorized into one of the three groups studied. Where possible, organizational charts for the foodservice departments were utilized for clarification and identification of position and the corresponding manager group. A list of position titles in each manager group are included in Appendix I.

Data Analysis

Programs and routines in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) were used for most of the data analysis (52). Data were sorted into the three managerial groups before data analysis began. The initial analysis included compilation of frequencies for importance, and time demand ratings, and demographic information. Chi square analysis was conducted to examine the frequency distribution of demographic variables.

Means were then computed by group for the activity statement's importance and time demand ratings. Before computing means, actual ratings for both scales were reversed to make higher scores represent more positive ratings. The scale for importance became 1, not part of my job or non-essential to 5, essential and the scale

for time demand became 1, not part of my job directly to 6, daily.

Activity statements were categorized into one of Mintzberg's ten managerial roles. Scores for further analysis were derived by averaging responses to the activities in each role; separate scores were computed for each of the 10 importance and 10 time demand scores. Reliability of the role scores was estimated using the coefficient alpha procedure in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (53). Correlation among the resulting role scores were computed to examine interrelationships.

A multivariate analysis of variance of the role scores was conducted to determine which of four variables, manager group, level of education, sex, and years in profession significantly affected ratings. Univariate analyses of variance were then conducted to examine the differences of each of the 10 importance and time demand scores.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Sample

College and university foodservice managers included in this study were from the National Association of College and University Food Service (NACUFS) member schools with a minimum annual budget of $3 million. Managers were categorized into one of three hierarchial groups for the study:

Group 1: Associate/Assistant or Director of Foodservice

Group 2: Unit Manager

Group 3: Manager/Supervisor; Directly Responsible to Unit Manager

Questionnaires were received from 1,086 foodservice managers in 80 colleges and universities; 87 of the questionnaires were disqualified because the manager was not in one of the three groups leaving 999 questionnaires for analysis. Thirteen percent of the managers were in Group 1, 38 percent in Group 2, and 49 percent in Group 3. The increase in size from Group 1 to 3 is not unexpected as the groups represent three hierarchial levels in college and university foodservice with Group 1 being the top. Typically, organizational structures widen when moving from the top down.

Gender, age, education level, and registration status for each group of managers are reported in Table 1. Manager groups differed significantly for each of the characteristics.

Group 1 managers were predominately male (68.3%), whereas Group 3 managers were predominately female (62.1%). Group 2 managers were

Table 1. Demographic profile of managers in college and university foodservice

characteristics	group[1]			total[2]	Chi square
	1	2	3		
	← percent →				
gender					38.17***
female	31.7	55.7	62.1	55.6	
male	68.3	44.3	37.9	44.4	
age					50.75***
20-29	3.2	15.3	26.0	18.5	
30-39	33.9	35.8	34.8	35.0	
40-49	32.2	23.6	17.4	22.0	
50-59	21.3	19.1	16.9	18.6	
over 60	9.4	6.2	4.9	5.9	
highest level of education					75.38***
high school diploma	10.2	25.8	38.1	29.1	
trade/associate degree	7.2	9.0	9.6	8.8	
bachelor's degree	43.3	39.6	34.2	37.1	
graduate work	17.3	14.9	8.3	13.0	
master's degree	22.0	8.2	5.5	8.9	
other	0.0	2.5	4.3	3.1	
R.D. status					15.03***
registered	12.6	9.2	3.9	7.9	
non-registered	87.4	90.8	96.1	92.1	

[1]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit managers) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

[2]Total percentage of all managers. N = 1062-1068

***$p < .001$.

divided fairly equally by gender.

The majority of Group 1 managers were over the age of 40 (62.9%) whereas, approximately half of the Group 2 managers were under the age of 40 (51.1%). Over sixty percent of Group 3 managers (63.8%) were under the age of 40.

Most of Group 1 managers had a bachelor's degree or more (82.6%); the majority of Group 2 managers (62.7%) also had a bachelor's degree or more. In contrast, almost half of the managers in Group 3 had a high school diploma or trade/associate degree only (47.7%), but approximately the same number held a bachelor's degree or more (48.0%).

Less than a tenth of all college and university foodservice managers in this study were Registered Dietitians (R.D.). Managers in Group 1 or 2 were more likely (12.6% and 9.2% respectively) than Group 3 to have R.D. status. One institution had 11 percent of the Registered Dietitians sampled in the study.

Data on manager's employment background are shown in Table 2. Chi square analysis indicated significant difference between the groups of managers for both years employed in present organization and years in profession.

Approximately half of the managers in Group 1 had been employed in their present organization over 10 years (46.5%). In contrast, the majority of managers in Group 2 and 3 had been employed in their present organization under 10 years (63.0% and 71.1% respectively).

Almost all of the managers in this study were employed full time. All of Group 1 managers and 99% of Group 2 and 3 managers were employed full-time.

Table 2. Employment profile of college and university foodservice managers

characteristic	group[1]			total[2]	Chi square
	1	2	3		
	← percent →				
years employed in present organization					37.71***
0-5	29.9	34.3	48.7	40.4	
6-10	23.6	28.7	22.4	25.3	
11-20	30.0	24.1	19.6	24.0	
21-30	14.1	12.6	8.5	9.5	
over 30	2.4	0.3	0.8	0.8	
current employment status					.79
part-time	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.5	
full-time	100.0	99.5	99.4	99.5	
years in profession					129.99***
0-10	14.2	39.8	58.1	44.5	
11-20	37.0	34.8	27.9	31.6	
21-30	33.8	17.7	9.1	16.2	
31-40	14.2	6.6	4.0	6.5	
over 40	0.8	1.1	0.9	1.2	

[1]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit managers) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit managers) N = 472-492

[2]Total percentage of all managers. N = 1062-1068

***$p < .001$.

Approximately half of Group 1 managers had been in practice over 20 years (48.8%). Managers in Group 2 and 3 had been in practice for less time. Over a third (39.8%) of the managers in Group 2 and over half (58.1%) of the managers in Group 3 had been in practice 10 years or less.

A composite of managers in each group indicates that Group 1 managers, the assistant/associate and directors of foodservice, were predominately males over the age of 40 with a bachelor's degree or higher level of education. All were employed full time; many had been with their organization at least 10 years and in practice for over 20 years.

Group 2 managers, unit managers, were divided fairly evenly by gender, and half were under the age of 40. Although many had a college degree, one-fourth of the managers in Group 2 had a high school level of education. Over 99 percent were employed full-time and half had been employed in their present organization under 10 years. Only one-fourth of Group 2 managers had been in practice over 20 years.

Group 3 managers, directly responsible to the unit manager, were predominately female with almost two-thirds under 40 years of age. Half did not have a college degree and 99 percent were employed full-time. Most had been employed in their present organization under 10 years and many had not been in practice for more than 10 years.

Hospital dietetics managers in Palacio's (51) study differed from managers in this study, because most were female Registered Dietitians with a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.

The majority of males in Palacio's study were in upper administration which was similar to this study. Also similar was Palacio's finding that age increased proportionate to the level of position.

Analysis of Importance and Time Demand Ratings

Importance of managerial activities

For initial analysis of the 51 managerial activity statements, mean importance ratings were classified into four categories: essential (4.5+), very important (3.5 to 4.49), fairly important (2.5 to 3.49), and of minor importance or not part of my job (less than 2.5). The percent of activities for each mean rating was determined for the three groups of managers. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis.

The mean ratings by Group 1 managers for approximately three-fourths of the activities were essential or very important. Only two percent of the activities were rated as of minor importance or not part of the manager's job.

Importance rating for Group 2 managers were somewhat lower than those of Group 1; the majority of activities were in the very important to fairly important range. Very few of the mean ratings were in the essential category and one-fifth of the activities were rated as not part of my job or non-essential.

Group 3 managers rated two-thirds of the activities in the combined very important or fairly important range. Almost one-third of the activities were rated as not part of my job or non-essential.

Table 3. Importance ratings of managerial activities by three groups of college and university foodservice managers

importance ratings[1]	← percent of activities[2] →		
	group[3]		
	1	2	3
essential (4.5+)	11.75	7.81	3.92
very important (3.5 to 4.49)	60.77	43.15	35.29
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49)	25.48	29.42	31.37
minor importance or not part of my job (2.5 or less)	2.00	19.62	29.42

[1]Scale = 1, not part of my job or non-essential to 5, essential.

[2]% of 51 managerial activities rated by the various groups according to the ranges established from mean ratings.

[3]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit manager) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

These data indicate those in lower level administrative positions (Group 3) tended to rate activities as less important than did those in the middle or high level administrative positions (Group 1 or 2). Similar findings were indicated by Palacio (51), who stated perceived importance tended to be greater at higher administrative levels.

Mean importance ratings

College and university foodservice managers rated the importance of 51 activity statements on a five point scale scored as 1, not part

of my job to 5, essential. Importance ratings for all statements are shown in Appendix J: Table 17 for Group 1 managers, Table 18 for Group 2, and Table 19 for Group 3.

Mean ratings of essential activities for importance as indicated by the three groups of managers are shown in Table 4. Six activities were rated as essential by Group 1 managers. The most essential activity was maintaining standards of quality.

Other activities rated as essential included communicating and information gathering. Activities rated highest by upper level hospital foodservice administrators in Palacio's (51) study also tended to focus on standards of quality, information gathering, and communicating.

Group 2 managers rated four activity statements as essential. Maintaining standards of quality again was rated as most critical of the essential activities (Table 4). Supervisory duties, including training, received high importance ratings by Group 2 managers. Middle level administrators in the Palacio study (51) also rated activities including maintaining quality standards and leadership activities dealing with subordinates as most important.

Group 3 managers rated maintaining standards of quality and training employees as essential for importance. The low administrative group in the Palacio study (51) rated information gathering activities and leading employees as most important.

Maintaining standards of quality was the activity rated highest by all three groups of managers. Managers in Groups 1 and 2 indicated influencing work performance of subordinates as an essential activity

Table 4. Importance for activities rated essential[1] by three groups[2] of college and university foodservice managers

activity statement		mean importance ratings[3]
Group 1 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.79
22	holding informational meetings	4.57
24	communicating with superiors and subordinates	4.57
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	4.54
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	4.54
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.50
Group 2 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.85
11	influencing work performance by subordinates	4.61
26	training employees	4.57
29	initiating corrective action on personnel problems	4.50
Group 3 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.87
26	training employees	4.65

[1]Refer to Tables 17-19 in Appendix J for mean ratings of importance for all activity statements.

[2]Group classification by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit manager) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

[3]Scale = 1, not part of my job or non-essential, to 5, essential.

for importance; whereas Group 2 and 3 managers indicated training employees was an essential activity.

Time demand of managerial activities

For initial analysis of the 51 activity statements, mean time demand ratings were classified into four categories: weekly or more (4.5+), once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49), several times/year (2.5 to 3.49), and about once/year or not part of my job directly (less than 2.5). The percent of activities for each mean rating was determined for the three groups of managers. Table 5 shows the results of the analysis.

Over 90 percent of the time demand ratings by Group 1 were 2.5 or more indicating most activities were performed several times a year or more. Approximately one-third of the activities were rated by Group 1 managers as being performed on a weekly basis.

Approximately one-third of the activities were rated as being completed about one time/year or were not part of the Group 2 managers job directly. Group 2 managers rated over 40 percent of the activities as being completed twice/month.

Many of the activities were rated by Group 3 managers as performed about one time/year or not part of my job directly. Over 40 percent of the remaining activities were rated as being performed at least twice/month or more.

Table 5: Time demand ratings of managerial activities by three groups of college and university foodservice managers

time demand ratings[1]	← percent of activities[2] →		
	group[3]		
	1	2	3
weekly or more (4.5+)	31.37	27.45	21.57
once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49)	21.57	17.65	23.53
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49)	37.26	23.53	11.76
about once/year or not part of job directly (2.5 or less)	9.80	31.37	43.14

[1]Scale = 1, not part of my job directly to 6, daily.

[2]% of 51 managerial activities rated by the various groups according to the ranges established from mean ratings.

[3]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit manager) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

Mean ratings for time demand

Means and standard deviations of time demand ratings computed for the 51 managerial activities are shown in Appendix J: Table 20 for Group 1 managers, Table 21 for Group 2 and Table 22 for Group 3 managers. Those activities rated most time demanding are presented in Table 6.

The most time demanding activity by Group 1 managers, was maintaining standards of quality. Many of the activities rated highest for time demand included information gathering, communicating,

Table 6. Mean time demand for activities rated weekly or more[1] by three groups[2] of college and university foodservice managers

	activity statements	mean time demand ratings[3]
Group 1 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.54
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.52
32	making observations to obtain information	5.36
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.10
24	communicating with superiors and subordinates	5.10
30	conveying information to subordinates	4.93
22	holding informational meetings	4.93
25	keeping in touch with peers	4.82
7	programming departmental work	4.82
33	reporting to superiors	4.80
14	reading information from outside contacts	4.74
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.73
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.73
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.69
15	working with other departments	4.68
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	4.52
Group 2 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.81
32	making observations to obtain information	5.41

[1]Weekly or more (4.5+). (Refer to Tables 20-22 Appendix J for mean ratings of time demand for all activity statements.)

[2]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit managers) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

[3]Scale = 1, not part of my job directly, to 6, daily.

Table 6. (cont.)

	activity statements	mean time demand ratings
Group 2 managers (cont.)		
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.37
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.36
25	keeping in touch with peers	5.12
30	conveying information to subordinates	5.04
24	working with employees to reach agreement	4.95
26	training employees	4.83
33	reporting to superiors	4.78
22	holding informational meetings	4.72
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.69
29	taking corrective action on personnel problems	4.63
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.58
7	programming departmental work	4.58
Group 3 managers		
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.87
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.37
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.34
32	making observations to obtain information	5.30
25	keeping in touch with peers	5.28
30	conveying information to subordinates	5.11
26	training employees	5.09
24	working with employees to reach agreement	5.02
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.92
33	reporting to superiors	4.70
29	taking corrective action to reach agreement	4.63

and dealing with subordinates. Many of these same activities also had been rated as most important by those managers.

Group 2 managers rated fourteen activities in the weekly or more category; maintaining standards of quality was rated as most demanding. All but two of the statements performed weekly were the same as those in Group 1. Such findings suggest possible similarities in the work performed by managers in top and unit level management in college and university foodservice. However, managers in Group 1 indicated high time demand for tasks such as making observations, reading information, and making contacts with persons outside the organization; whereas, managers in Group 2 included the following two supervisory activities being performed weekly: training and taking corrective action.

Eleven activities were rated by Group 3 managers as performed on a weekly basis. The same eleven activities were also rated as performed weekly by Group 1 and 2 managers. Again, maintaining standards of quality was rated as being performed most frequently.

Maintaining standards of quality also was rated as important on the time demand scale by upper, middle, and lower level administrators in the Palacio (51) study of hospital dietitians. Palacio indicated activities demanding large amounts of time differed from those with high importance ratings and suggested importance and time were viewed independently by respondents as two different dimensions of managerial work. In contrast, for this study the majority of activities rated as time consuming by the three groups of college and university managers were rated as essential on the importance scale.

Analysis of Managerial Roles

Categorization of activities into roles

Each of the 51 activity statements was categorized into Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles as in Palacio's (51) study. Categorization of the statements are shown in Table 23, Appendix J. A total of 20 variables resulted; ten based on importance ratings and ten on time demand.

Scores were obtained by averaging the ratings of activities in each role. Reliability of categorization was checked using the coefficient alpha procedure.

Coefficient alpha provides a standard method for estimating the reliability of scales that contain no "right" or "wrong" answer. It is based on internal consistency (positive correlations) among the items composing a scale; a coefficient alpha of .40 is considered a minimally acceptable level (54). Two activity statements, 25 and 28, were deleted from the time demand categories and one, 28, was eliminated from importance because reliability of the score improved when statements were deleted.

Coefficient alpha values for each role score are shown in Table 7 for importance and Table 8 for time demand. Values ranged from .50 to .77 for the ten importance role scores which suggest a moderate degree of internal consistency among items.

Time demand role score coefficient alpha values ranged from .37 to .70. A moderate degree of internal consistency existed in all but the negotiator role score. Elimination of items from the negotiator

Table 7. Reliability of scores on importance from ratings of activity statements[1]

role score[2]	coefficient alpha
interpersonal	
figurehead	.72
leader	.77
liaison	.65
informational	
disseminator	.58
monitor	.59
spokesman	.65
decisional	
disturbance handler	.51
initiator	.75
negotiator	.50
resource allocator	.72

[1]Based on total of all managers N = 909-999.

[2]Refer to Table 23 in Appendix J for items used in computing score. Score = average of statement ratings.

Table 8. Reliability of scores on time demand from ratings of activity statements[1]

role score[2]	coefficient alpha
interpersonal	
figurehead	.65
leader	.70
liaison	.56
informational	
disseminator	.49
monitor	.52
spokesman	.52
decisional	
disturbance handler	.55
initiator	.68
negotiator	.37
resource allocator	.57

[1]Based on total of all managers N = 909-999.

[2]Refer to Table 23 in Appendix J for items used in computing each score. Score = average of statement ratings.

role score produced little increase in reliability, thus the original four items categorized under that role were retained. Coefficient alpha for the negotiator role was rated lowest for both importance and time demand.

Correlation of importance and time demand role scores

Correlation coefficients in Tables 9-11 were computed to examine the relationship between demographic information and importance and time demand role scores. Correlations of .00 to .39 were termed as low, .40 to .79 as moderate, and .80 and above as high (55).

Correlations between demographic variables and 10 importance role scores are shown in Table 9. The highest correlations in demographic data were noted between variables sharing the element of time; i.e., age with years in the profession (.70), age and years employed in the organization (.58), and years in the profession and years employed in the organization (.51). Negative correlations were noted between manager group and variables such as age and level of education. These results are not surprising given the demographic data presented in Table 1. Group 1 managers, for example, were older and more educated than were managers in Group 3.

Correlations between the importance role scores were the highest between the figurehead role and the spokesman (.70) and liaison (.69) roles and also between the resource allocator and initiator (.70) (Table 9). However, all correlation coefficients for the importance role scores were .40 or higher indicating the importance of these roles appears to be similar.

Table 9. Correlation coefficients for importance role scores[1]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. sex																
2. level of education	-.07															
3. group	-.18	-.26														
4. age	-.03n.s.	-.22	-.18													
5. years employed in organization	-.09	-.22	-.17	.58												
6. years in profession	.16	-.13	-.33	.70	.51											
7. leader	.06n.s.	.07	-.22	-.06n.s.	-.04n.s.	-.02n.s.										
8. spokesman	.10	.13	-.26	.04n.s.	.03n.s.	.14	.42									
9. initiator	.12	.12	-.39	.02n.s.	.05n.s.	.12	.50	.58								
10. figurehead	.10	.08	-.34	.10	.13	.16	.42	.70	.58							
11. disseminator	.03n.s.	.08	-.25	.02n.s.	.03	.08	.49	.46	.48	.45						
12. resource allocator	.14	.17	-.49	.08	.10	.18	.48	.52	.70	.58	.44					
13. negotiator	.07	-.02n.s.	-.23	.06n.s.	.06n.s.	.07	.47	.46	.53	.50	.45	.57				
14. liaison	.08	.09	-.27	.04n.s.	.08	.14	.47	.66	.64	.69	.51	.56	.55			
15. disturbance handler	.04n.s.	.02n.s.	-.17	.05n.s.	.06n.s.	.08	.51	.40	.49	.40	.50	.43	.44	.44		
16. monitor	.11	.16	-.28	-.02n.s.	-.02n.s.	.05n.s.	.55	.51	.57	.47	.65	.50	.49	.57	.53	

[1] N varies from 899 to 969.

All r values significant at $p \leq .05$ with the exceptions noted.

On the time demand scale (Table 10), the strongest correlation was between the resource allocator and the initiator roles (.61) and the liaison and figurehead roles (.61). Approximately half of the coefficients were below .40 indicating time demands of roles were not as highly rated to each other.

Correlations between each managerial importance role score and its related time demand score (Table 11) were found to be moderately high (.51 and above) for all ten roles: leader (.59), spokesman (.65), initiator (.73), figurehead (.72), disseminator (.69), resource allocator (.70), negotiator (.60), liaison (.64), disturbance handler (.51), and monitor (.65). In all cases, a roles' importance and time ratings were more highly correlated with each other than with some other roles' ratings. These results suggest that as a role was rated more important, time demand increased. Palacio (51) reported a similar correlation between importance and time demand ratings for the 10 roles in her study of hospital dietitians.

Analysis of mean importance and time demand role scores

Based on the correlation data, multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to determine which of the following four variables were significantly affecting the role score ratings: manager group, level of education, gender, and years in the profession. Significant differences in ratings were indicated for manager's group and level of education. The significant multivariate tests allowed for use of univariate analyses of variance to examine these differences.

Table 10. Correlation coefficients for time demand role scores[1]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. sex	⌜					⌝										
2. education																
3. group																
4. age			see Table 9													
5. years in organization																
6. years in profession	⌞					⌟										
7. leader	.03n.s.	.02n.s.	.02n.s.	-.13	-.12	-.11										
8. spokesman	.14	.14	-.27	.01n.s.	-.02n.s.	.10	.30									
9. initiator	.13	.11	-.32	-.03n.s.	-.00n.s.	.08	.36	.49								
10. figurehead	.17	.19	-.45	.05n.s.	.07	.17	.21	.57	.49							
11. disseminator	.05n.s.	.13	-.24	-.01n.s.	.00n.s.	.05n.s.	.27	.40	.39	.37						
12. resource allocator	.14	.13	-.38	.01n.s.	.02n.s.	.08	.34	.42	.61	.49	.41					
13. negotiator	.08	-.06n.s.	-.13	.01n.s.	.01n.s.	.00n.s.	.41	.37	.44	.32	.33	.47				
14. liaison	.11	.16	-.33	.01n.s.	.03n.s.	.11	.27	.54	.55	.61	.38	.50	.37			
15. disturbance handler	-.04n.s.	-.07	.11	-.04n.s.	-.04n.s.	-.05n.s.	.46	.28	.32	.17	.30	.24	.35	.22		
16. monitor	.08	.19	-.17	-.13	-.11	-.07	.38	.39	.42	.34	.57	.40	.32	.42	.35	

[1] N = 904 to 963.

All r values significant at $p \leq .05$ unless otherwise indicated.

Table 11. Correlation coefficients for importance and time demand role scores[1]

	importance									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
time demand										
1. leader	.59									
2. spokesman	.20	.65								
3. initiator	.30	.36	.73							
4. figurehead	.25	.51	.46	.72						
5. disseminator	.31	.30	.34	.29	.69					
6. resource allocator	.31	.31	.50	.32	.29	.70				
7. negotiator	.19	.20	.27	.19	.20	.27	.60			
8. liaison	.25	.41	.46	.43	.28	.41	.30	.64		
9. disturbance handler	.20	.14	.15	.10	.18	.07	.19	.13	.51	
10. monitor	.33	.26	.35	.21	.43	.26	.23	.31	.33	.65

[1] N = 899 to 969.

All r values significant at $p \leq .05$.

Importance role scores. Results of the multivariate and subsequent univariate analyses of variance of the importance role scores categorized by managerial groups are shown in Table 12. Significant differences in importance ratings between the three managerial groups were indicated for all 10 roles. Importance ratings for seven of the 10 roles were highest by Group 1 managers. Managers in Group 2 tended to rate importance lower than Group 1 managers but higher than Group 3. The disseminator and monitor roles were rated as very important by all three groups; whereas the figurehead and liaison roles received the lowest ratings.

Table 13 presents results of analysis of importance role score ratings by level of education. Significant differences were noted as a result of education level for only three of the 10 roles: monitor, negotiator, and disturbance handler. These findings suggest the importance rating of most roles was not affected by the education level of the manager.

These results confirmed Palacio's (51) conclusion that managers in higher hierarchial levels tend to rate roles as more important than do lower level managers. Palacio also reported the leader, monitor, disseminator, and disturbance handler roles were important for all administrative levels. These same four roles were rated as essential or very important by all three levels of managers in this study.

Alexander (30) found six managerial roles including monitor, disseminator, spokesman, figurehead, liaison, and initiator (entrepreneur) were required to a greater extent in the higher levels of the hierarchy. This study partially supports the Alexander study

Table 12. Comparison of mean scores from importance ratings categorized by managerial group[1]

role score	group[2]			F value
	1	2	3	
	← mean[3] →			
interpersonal				
leader	3.98	4.09	3.65	37.70***
figurehead	2.90	2.46	2.03	60.57***
liaison	3.20	2.87	2.62	37.94***
informational				
spokesman	3.16	2.79	2.54	36.96***
disseminator	4.21	4.08	3.77	33.69***
monitor	4.15	4.00	3.68	41.74***
decisional				
initiator	4.09	3.36	2.81	90.58***
resource allocator	4.23	3.56	2.80	152.47***
negotiator	3.82	3.45	3.20	26.24***
disturbance handler	4.03	4.00	3.72	16.55***
multivariate				17.47*** (d.f. = 20,1884)

[1]Note: Groups underlined are significantly different. All indicated difference between groups were significant at the $\leq .05$ level.

[2]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit manager) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

[3]Scale: 1, not part of my job or non-essential to 5, essential.

***$p \leq .001$.

Table 13. Comparison of mean scores from importance ratings categorized by education level[1]

role score	education level[2]					F value
	1	2	3	4	5	
	← mean[3] →					
interpersonal						
leader	3.89	3.88	3.90	3.89	3.98	.35
figurehead	2.48	2.48	2.47	2.41	2.49	.34
liaison	2.90	2.94	2.83	2.84	2.96	.96
informational						
spokesman	2.75	2.95	2.82	2.74	2.90	1.86
disseminator	3.99	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.13	1.91
monitor	3.84	3.98	3.89	3.92	4.09	2.82*
decisional						
initiator	3.44	3.45	3.32	3.36	3.54	1.02
resource allocator	3.50	3.70	3.39	3.45	3.62	2.01
negotiator	3.61	3.47	3.53	3.35	3.48	4.09**
disturbance handler	3.94	3.92	3.96	3.79	3.98	2.42*
multivariate						19.92*** (d.f. = 20,1862)

[1]Note: Groups underlined are significantly different. All indicated difference between groups were significant at the < .05.

[2]Educational level: 1 = high school diploma, 2 = trade/assoc. degree, 3 = bachelor's degree, 4 = graduate work, 5 = master's degree.

[3]Scale: 1, not part of my job or non-essential, to 5, essential.

*$p \leq .05$.
**$p \leq .01$.

in that spokesman, initiator (entrepreneur), figurehead, resource allocator, negotiator, liaison, and monitor roles were exercised by college and university managers proportionate to the position in the hierarchy.

Paolillo (31) reported the monitor role to be the most important of the 10 roles for top level managers; however top level managers in this study rated monitor as less important than resource allocator and disseminator. Group 2 managers rated the leader role as most important which supports Paolillo's findings that the leader role was most indicative of middle level managers. Group 3 managers rated disturbance handler higher than Group 1. Low level managers in Paolillo's (31) study rated disturbance handler and liaison roles as more important than middle or top level managers.

Pavett and Lau (32) indicated importance of managerial roles were similar across all three levels of management which was supported by this study. Lower level managers rated the leader role as more important than the other two levels of managers in Pavett and Lau's (32) study, but this study did not support that finding.

Time demand role scores. Results of the multivariate and subsequent univariate analyses of variance of the time demand role scales by group are shown in Table 14. Significant differences in ratings between groups were indicated for all ten roles. Group 1 ratings tended to be higher than those by Groups 2 and 3 with two exceptions. Group 2 managers rated time demand for the leader role higher than did Group 1; Group 2 and 3 managers rated time demand of

Table 14. Comparison of mean scores from time demand ratings categorized by managerial group[1]

role score	group[2]			F value
	1	2	3	
	← mean[3] →			
interpersonal				
leader	3.36	3.60	3.50	5.02**
liaison	2.80	2.34	2.05	65.44***
figurehead	3.02	2.35	1.91	122.90***
informational				
spokesman	3.16	2.74	2.53	43.82***
disseminator	4.78	4.62	4.29	30.10***
monitor	4.56	4.48	4.27	17.34***
decisional				
initiator	3.60	3.00	2.62	57.65***
resource allocator	4.02	3.33	2.81	99.29***
negotiator	3.73	3.33	3.26	10.89***
disturbance handler	3.23	3.64	3.63	10.32***
multivariate				19.92*** (d.f. = 20,1862)

[1]Note: Groups underlined are significantly different. All indicated difference between groups were significant at $\leq .05$.

[2]Groups classified by organizational level. N varies as follows:
Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127
Group 2 (unit manager) N = 368-379
Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492

[3]Scale: 1, not part of my job directly to 6, daily.

** $p \leq .01$.
*** $p \leq .001$.

disturbance handler role significantly higher than did Group 1. The disseminator and monitor roles received the highest time demand ratings by all three groups, whereas the liaison and figurehead roles received the lowest.

Table 15 indicates the effect of education level on time demand ratings. No significant differences were disclosed for six of the 10 roles. All three informational roles showed a significant difference in mean time demand rating based on level of education. Managers with a master's degree rated all three informational roles (spokesman, disseminator, and monitor) as more time demanding than those with only a high school education.

Findings in this study supported Palacio (51) in regard to time demand ratings for the roles. Both studies indicated the monitor and dissimator roles were performed most frequently. Findings in the Palacio study (51) indicated figurehead, negotiator, and resource allocator were performed less frequently than the other seven roles. The current study found the figurehead and liaison roles were performed less frequently than the other roles.

Table 15. Comparison of mean scores from time demand ratings categorized by education level[1]

role score	education level[2]					F value
	1	2	3	4	5	
	← mean[3] →					
interpersonal						
leader	3.43	3.44	3.46	3.49	3.62	1.48
figurehead	2.32	2.55	2.38	2.42	2.47	1.81
liaison	2.30	2.44	2.38	2.40	2.46	1.54
informational						
spokesman	2.69	2.87	2.80	2.74	2.95	2.95*
disseminator	4.45	4.63	4.54	4.48	4.71	2.43*
monitor	4.21	4.52	4.37	4.49	4.59	7.45***
decisional						
initiator	3.03	3.09	3.03	3.01	3.21	1.09
resource allocator	3.32	3.41	3.40	3.32	3.48	.84
negotiator	3.54	3.30	3.60	3.28	3.47	5.23***
disturbance handler	3.53	3.39	3.63	3.39	3.57	1.80
multivariate						2.63*** (d.f. = 40,3532.10)

[1]Note: Groups underlined are significantly different. All indicated difference between groups were significant at the $\leq$ .05 level.

[2]Education level: 1 = high school diploma, 2 = trade/assoc. degree, 3 = bachelor's degree, 4 = graduate work, 5 = master's degree.

[3]Scale: 1, not part of my job directly to 6, daily.

*$p \leq .05$.
***$p \leq .001$.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Many authors agree that knowledgeable, experienced individuals are needed to manage college and university foodservices. Research is limited, however, on the effective duties these managers perform.

Mintzberg (34) espoused the role theory of management in his book entitled The Nature of Managerial Work. In this text, he identified 10 roles all managers perform regardless of their position.

Palacio et al. (6) conducted a study which applied Mintzberg's role theory to foodservice managers in hospitals. The professional staff members of hospital dietetic services at various organizational levels in administrative and clinical practice were studied. An instrument, using Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles as the conceptual framework, was developed to assess managerial roles of these professionals.

This study was designed to extend research on managerial roles into the area of college and university foodservice management. The purpose of this study was to examine roles of college and university foodservice managers at different organizational levels. Specific objectives of the study were to determine perceived importance and time required for managerial activities and to compare perceived importance and time required for ten managerial roles in three hierarchial levels of managers.

Sample

The research sample was drawn from the foodservice management staff of NACUFS member institutions operating with a minimum annual budget of $3 million. The NACUFS executive board endorsed the research project and gave partial financial support of $500.

An inquiry to identify a satisfactory sample was sent to directors of 152 colleges and universities requesting information on the number of managers/supervisors in managerial positions. The inquiry also requested verification of an annual foodservice budget of $3 million or more and a copy of the organizational chart. A 64.9 percent return was obtained from an initial and follow-up mailing. Managers in 100 college and university foodservice departments were selected as the final sample. Three groups of managers were included in the study:

Group 1: Associate/Assistant or Directors of Foodservice

Group 2: Unit Level Managers

Group 3: Manager/Supervisor; Directly Responsible to Unit Manager

Development and distribution of the research instrument

A revised, shortened version of the 80 item questionnaire developed and pretested by Palacio (51) was used for this study. The questionnaire was based on role descriptions categorized into Mintzberg's (34-36) 10 managerial roles. The final questionnaire contained 51 activity statements and a biographical section requesting

information on gender, age, education level, registration status, years in the present organization, present employment status, and years in the profession.

Activities were rated using two scales: a 5 point relative importance scale, ranging from 1, essential, to 5, not part of my job or non-essential and a six point time demand scale ranging from 1, daily, to 6, not part of my job directly.

Each of the 100 college and university foodservice directors, who responded to the inquiry statement, was mailed a letter indicating the packet of research materials would be arriving shortly. This announcement mailing also included an endorsement letter from the 1986 NACUFS president.

A mailing containing a cover letter to the foodservice director, several manager's packets, and one large, stamped return envelope were sent to the 100 participating colleges and universities. Foodservice directors were asked to distribute the packets to those managers in the three groups included in the study. Questionnaires from 80 (80%) of the colleges and universities were returned. Organizational charts were received from 67 (67%) of the colleges and universities.

Characteristics of the college and university foodservice managers

Group 1 managers, associate/assistant and foodservice directors, were predominately males over the age of 40. Most had a bachelor's degree and many had completed graduate work. Half of Group 1 managers had been employed in the organization for over 10 years and many had

been in practice over 20 years.

Group 2 managers, unit managers, were divided almost equally in gender, and half were under the age of 40. Only one-fourth of Group 2 managers had been in practice over 20 years.

Group 3, the manager responsible to the unit manager, was predominately female, with approximately two-thirds under 40 years of age and half were not college graduates. Group 3 managers had been employed in their present organization for 10 years or less and many had not been in practice for more than 10 years.

Very few college and university foodservice managers were Registered Dietitians (7.9%). In the three groups of managers, over 99 percent were employed on a full-time basis.

Analysis of ratings of managerial activities

The analysis of importance and time demand ratings of the 51 managerial activity statements indicated that activities became increasingly important in successively higher levels in the organizational hierarchy. Many of the same activities rated as essential for importance were also rated as being performed on a weekly basis or more. Maintaining standards of quality was rated by all three groups as the activity most essential and also performed most frequently.

Each of the 51 activity statements was categorized into Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles. Correlations between each managerial importance role score and related time demand score were found to be moderately high for all ten roles.

Multivariate analysis of variance of role scores was conducted

to determine the effect of the following four variables: manager group, level of education, gender, and years in the profession. Univariate analysis of variance was then conducted to examine the two significant variables, manager group and level of education. Significant differences in importance ratings between the three managerial groups were indicated for all 10 roles. Disseminator and monitor roles were rated as very important by all three groups of managers. Figurehead and liaison roles received low importance ratings.

Perceived time demand by the three groups of managers differed for each role. Time demand for roles increased in higher levels in the organizational hierarchy. Two exceptions were noted; Group 2 and 3 managers rated the disturbance handler role as requiring more time than did Group 1 and Group 2 managers rated the leader role as more time demanding. Disseminator and monitor roles were rated highest for time demand by all three groups of managers, whereas liaison and figurehead roles received the lowest ratings.

For the importance ratings, only three roles differed based on educational level of the manager rating them: monitor, negotiator, and disturbance handler. For the time demand scale, four roles differed based on education level: spokesman, disseminator, monitor, and negotiator.

Conclusions

Maintaining standards of quality was rated as essential and performed on a weekly basis by all three levels of managers in college and university foodservice. This finding may be attributed to the

nature of jobs in the foodservice industry in which managers are constantly dealing with maintaining quality in several areas; food, personnel, and customers relations. Further research is needed to clarify activities performed related to maintaining quality standards.

Managers in Group 3 rated almost half of the activity statements of minor importance. Additional research is needed to determine the type of activity performed by this group which they consider to be important.

All three groups of managers rated the disseminator and monitor roles as most important. Such findings suggest much importance is placed on gathering, interpreting, and disseminating of information to others by college and university foodservice managers.

Managers in Group 2 and 3 rated disturbance handler roles as requiring more than than Group 1 and Group 2 managers rated leader roles as more time demanding. The time spent working with employees appears to increase at lower levels of management in college and university foodservice possibly indicating those working closely with front line personnel spend more time in mediating activities than those in higher administrative foodservice positions.

Reviewing the foodservice organizational charts indicated a wide range of departmental organizations and job titles. Research is needed to determine similarities and differences in the actual organization of college and university foodservices.

Mintzberg's roles were applied successfully to Palacio's (51) study of hospital dietitians. This study extended the research to the area of college and university foodservice. Extending Mintzberg's

role theory to other aspects of the foodservice industry, both commercial and institutional, should be considered for further research.

REFERENCES

(1) Buchanan, R.O.: Productivity in the foodservice industry. Part 1. How do you know when your foodservice organization is operating effectively? Food Manag 38(2):49, 1976.

(2) Boyatzis, R.E.: The Competent Manager. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982.

(3) Erffmeyer, R.C.: Incorporation of the marketing concept: Applications in university contract foodservice management. J Am Diet Assoc 87:1215, 1987.

(4) Tinsley, E.: Technology: Foodservice found its voice. Institutions 83:61 (July), 1980.

(5) Mintzberg, H.: The manager at work--determining his activities, roles, and programs by structured observation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, M.I.T. Sloan School of Management, 1968.

(6) Palacio, J.P., Spears, M.C., Vaden, A.G., and Dayton, A.D.: The effect of organizational level and practice area on managerial work in hospital dietetic services. J Am Diet Assoc 85:799, 1985.

(7) Fayol, H.: General and Industrial Management. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949.

(8) Gulick, L.: Notes on the theory of organization. In Gulick, L., and Urwick, L., eds.: Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

(9) Barnard, C.I.: The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1938.

(10) Drucker, P.F.: The Practice of Management. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1954.

(11) Terry, G.: Principles of Management. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1956.

(12) Mahoney, T.A., Jerdee, T.H., and Carroll, S.J.: The jobs of management. Ind Relations 4(2):97, 1965.

(13) Strong, E.P.: The Management of Business. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

(14) Katz, R.L., and Rosenzweig, J.: Organization and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.

(15) Katz, R.L.: Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Bus Rev 33:33 (Jan./Feb.), 1955.

(16) Katz, R.L.: Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Bus Rev 52:90 (Sept./Oct.), 1974.

(17) Shartle, C.L.: Leadership and executive performance. Personnel 25:370, 1949.

(18) Sarbin, T.R., and Allen, V.L.: Role theory. In Lindzey, G., and Aronson, E., eds.: The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

(19) Choran, I.: The manager of a small company. Unpublished M.B.A. thesis, McGill University, 1969.

(20) McCall, M.W., Morrison, A.M., and Hannan, R.L.: Studies of managerial work: Results and methods (Technical Report No. 9). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, May, 1978.

(21) Frohman, A.L.: The performance of innovation: Managerial roles. Calif Manag Rev 20(3):5, 1978.

(22) Niles, M.C.: Middle Management: The Job of the Junior Administrator. New York: Harper, 1949.

(23) Martin, N.H.: Differential decisions in the management of an industrial plant. J Bus 29(4):249, 1956.

(24) Pfiffner, J.M., and Sherwood, F.P.: Administrative Organization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

(25) Sayles, L.R.: Managerial Behavior: Administration in Complex Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

(26) Katz, D., and Kahn, R.L.: The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

(27) Klahr, D., and Leavitt, H.J.: Tasks, organizational structures, and computer programs. In Myers, C.A., ed.: The Impact of Computers on Management. Cambridge, MS: MIT Press, 1967.

(28) Nealey, S.M., and Fiedler, F.E.: Leadership functions of middle managers. Psychol Bull 70(5):313, 1968.

(29) Katz, D., and Kahn, R.L.: The Social Psychology of Organizations. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

(30) Alexander, L.D.: The effects level in the hierarchy and functional area have on the extent Mintzberg's roles are required by managerial jobs. In Huseman, R.C., ed.: Proceedings of the Thirty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Atlanta, GA, Aug. 8-11, 1979.

(31) Paolillo, J.G.: Role profiles for managers at different hierarchical levels. In Chung, K.H., ed.: Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. San Diego, CA, Aug. 2-5, 1981.

(32) Pavett, C.M., and Lau, A.W.: Managerial work: The influence of hierarchical level and functional specialty. Acad Manag J 26:170, 1983.

(33) Hughes, G.D., and Singler, C.H.: Strategic Sales Management. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1985.

(34) Mintzberg, H.: Managerial work: Analysis from observation. Manag Sci 18(2), 1971.

(35) Mintzberg, H.: The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1973.

(36) Mintzberg, H.: The manager's job: Folklore and fact. Harvard Bus Rev 53:49 (July/Aug.), 1975.

(37) Tornow, W.W., and Pinto, P.R.: The development of a managerial job taxonomy: A system for describing, classifying, and evaluating executive positions. J Appl Psychol 61:410, 1976.

(38) Whitely, W.T.: Nature of managerial work revisited. In Susbauer, J.C., ed.: Proceedings of the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. San Francisco, CA, Aug. 9-13, 1978.

(39) Morse, J.J., and Wagner, F.R.: Measuring the process of managerial effectiveness. Acad Manag J 21:23, 1978.

(40) McCall, M.W., and Segrist, C.A.: In pursuit of the manager's job: Building on Mintzberg's (Technical Report No. 14). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, Mar., 1980.

(41) Snyder, N., and Glueck, W.F.: How managers plan--the analysis of manager's activities. Long Range Plan 13:70 (Mar.), 1980.

(42) Lau, A.W., Newman, A.R., and Broadling, L.A.: The nature of managerial work in the public sector. Public Admin Rev 40:513 (Sept./Oct.), 1980.

(43) Shapira, Z., and Dunbar, R.M.: Testing Mintzberg's managerial roles classification using an in-basket simulation. J Appl Psychol 65:87, 1980.

(44) Snyder, N.H., and Wheelen, T.L.: Managerial roles: Mintzberg and the management process theorists. In Chung, K.H., ed.: Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. San Diego, CA, Aug. 2-5, 1981.

(45) Bright, F.A.: An investigation into the effect of differences in selected personality types of the extent to which Mintzberg's managerial roles are emphasized by practicing managers. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1982.

(46) Kurke, L.B., and Aldrich, H.E.: Mintzberg was right! A replication and extension of the nature of managerial work. Manag Sci 29(8):975, 1983.

(47) Palacio, J.P., Spears, M.C., Vaden, A.G., and Downey, R.G.: Dimensions of managerial work in hospital dietetic services. J Am Diet Assoc 85:809, 1985.

(48) Prideaux, J.S., and Shugart, G.M.: Students' reactions to residence hall food. J Am Diet Assoc 49:38, 1966.

(49) Adams, C.K., and Vaden, A.G.: Functional responsibilities of college and university foodservice directors. NACUFS J 51, 1981.

(50) Bowers, R.S.: Foodservice trends--the next two years and beyond. NACUFS J, 1987.

(51) Palacio, J.P.: Managerial work in hospital dietetic service: The effect of organizational level and practice area. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Kansas State University, 1983.

(52) SAS User's Guide: Statistics, 5th ed. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc., 1985.

(53) Nie, N.H., Hall, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D.H.: SPSS--Statistical Package for Social Services. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

(54) Nunnally, J.C.: Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967.

(55) Falkner, F.: Physical development of children. Pediatrics 29:448, 1962.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Initial Correspondence and Sample Identification Inquiry to Foodservice Directors

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

August 6, 1986

Dear Director of Foodservice:

At Kansas State University (KSU), we are currently engaged in a research project to study the managerial roles of college and university foodservice managers. The project has been endorsed and partially funded by the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS).

Later this fall, you and other members of your management staff will be asked to participate by completing a questionnaire focusing on your daily activities. In order to identify the number of questionnaires to send to you, we are asking that you complete the enclosed form and return it with a copy of your department's organizational chart in the stamped self-addressed envelope.

The project is based on research conducted by Dr. Henry Mintzberg, a leading management researcher and analyzer of managerial behavior, who conducted a landmark study in which manager's work was defined into 10 activities. We have replicated his study on foodservice managers in medium to large hospitals. Because very little research has been published on the role of managers in college and university foodservices, the study would extend the KSU research to this very important area of foodservice management.

We would appreciate your returning the questionnaire by August 27, 1986, or as soon as possible. We hope you will be able to assist us with this research which should yield valuable data for recruitment and career guidance. Each participating foodservice will receive a summary of the results when the study has been completed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire, R.D., Ph.D
Assistant Professor

KSU
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Dietetics, Restaurant and Institutional Management

Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5521

How many foodservice staff members do you have whom you consider to have managerial or supervisory positions? _____

Does your foodservice have an annual budget of $3 million or more? Yes _____ No _____

PLEASE RETURN WITH A COPY OF YOUR ORGANIZATIONAL CHART.

THANK YOU!

(SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION INQUIRY)

APPENDIX B

Follow-up Letter to Initial Mailing

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

August 30, 1986

TO: Director of Foodservice

FROM: Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire, R.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Last month we sent you a form for a research study we are conducting at Kansas State University (KSU) on managerial roles of college and university foodservice managers. If you have completed the form and returned it with a copy of your organizational chart, thank you!

In case you did not receive the mailing or have mislaid the information, let us briefly describe the study. Later this fall, you and other members of your management staff will be asked to participate by completing a questionnaire focusing on your daily activities. In order to identify the number of questionnaires to send you, we are asking that you complete the enclosed form and return it with a copy of your department's organizational chart in the stamped self-addressed envelope.

This project, which has been endorsed and partially funded by the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS), is based on research conducted by Dr. Henry Mintzberg, a leading management researcher and analyzer of managerial behavior. He conducted a landmark study in which manager's work was defined into 10 activities. We have replicated Mintzberg's study on foodservice managers in medium to large hospitals. Because very little research has been published on the role of managers in college and university foodservices, the study would extend the KSU research to this very important area of foodservice management.

Confidentiality will be strictly maintained. Your organization's name will not be linked with any published results from the study.

As a college and university director, your participation in the study is vital for its success. We would appreciate your returning the form by September 17, 1986, or as soon as possible. We hope you will be able to assist us with this research which should yield valuable data for recruitment and career guidance. Each participating foodservice will receive a summary of the results when the study has been completed. Thank you.

APPENDIX C

Letter to NACUFS' President

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

June 25, 1986

To: John Pence
President-Elect, NACUFS

From: Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian
Derby Food Center

Mary B. Gregoire, Ph.D., R.D.
Assistant Professor
Dietetics, Restaurant
& Institutional Management

We are conducting research in the Department of Dietetics, Restaurant and Institutional Mangement to examine the roles of college and university foodservice management staff and are asking your assistance, as a member of the NACUFS Board of Directors, by:

- presenting to the NACUFS board members the proposed research project,
- distributing individual letters of information (30 copies enclosed) to each board member,
- eliciting the Board's endorsement and partial financial support for the project, and
- writing a letter of endorsement which will be sent with the questionnaire to NACUFS members (a suggested letter is attached)

Enclosed is one copy of the detailed research proposal. Please take it to the board meeting for members to review.

Little research has been conducted on the roles of managers in the field of college and university foodservice. The purpose of the KSU study will be

- to examine roles of mangerial staff in university foodservice at different organizational levels,
- to determine perceived importance and time required for various managerial activities, and
- to compare administrative managers in college and university and hospital foodservices.

NACUFS members working in institutions with an annual foodservice budget of $3 million or more will be surveyed.

Your presenting this project to the NACUFS Board of Directors will help provide the essential support, both participative and financial, needed to conduct the proposed research. Thank you.

APPENDIX D

Letter to NACUFS' Executive Board

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

July 1, 1986

Dear NACUFS Board Members:

At Kansas State University (KSU), we are currently engaged in a research project to study the roles of college and university foodservice managers. We are requesting that NACUFS endorse the project and provide some financial support. Your endorsement of the project is especially important, and we ask that you encourage NACUFS members to participate.

As you know, research funds are very limited in all universities today. Kansas State University will provide the following support for the project:

- Computer systems
- Statistical analysis
- Secretarial services
- Graduate faculty member

We are requesting that NACUFS partially fund the printing and mailing of the questionnaires (budget attached).

Dr. Henry Mintzberg, a leading management researcher and analyzer of managerial behavior, conducted a landmark study in which manager's work was defined into 10 activities. We have replicated his study on foodservice managers in medium to large hospitals. Because very little research has been published on the role of managers in college and university foodservices, the proposed study would extend the KSU research to this very important area of foodservice management.

Foodservice directors of NACUFS' institutions with a minimal annual budget of $3 million will be mailed a packet of questionnaires in the fall of 1986. Each member of the foodservice management staff will be asked to complete a questionnaire, in which information on the importance and time required for various management activities will be requested. A more detailed description of the study is outlined in the project proposal, which is available from John Pence, president-elect of NACUFS.

Results of the study could provide vital information to college and university foodservice managers for outlining organizational structures, defining managerial roles, writing job descriptions, and recruiting qualified managerial staff. A summary of the results from the study will be mailed to participants. Data from the research also will be submitted to a professional journal for publication.

Your participation and that of NACUFS members, whom you represent, will be very valuable to the research and, of course, your financial support will be appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian
Derby Food Center

Mary B. Gregoire, Ph.D., R.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Dietetics, Restaurant
& Institutional Management

QUESTIONNAIRE AND MAILING BUDGET

Initial and Follow-up Mailing	
Questionnaire Printing	$ 250.00
Mailing Labels	4.80
12 X 15 in. Envelopes (for mailing questionnaires to each institution)	37.50
Postage	1312.50
Return of Questionnaires	
4 X 9 in. Business Envelopes (for each questionnaire)	90.00
12 X 15 in. Postage Paid Return Envelope (for return of institution's questionnaires)	37.50
Return Postage	612.50
Summary to Participants	
Printing of Summary	10.50
4 X 9 in. Business Envelope (for mailing results to participants)	5.25
Mailing Labels	1.80
Postage	38.50
TOTAL	$ 2,400.85

APPENDIX E

Endorsement Letter from NACUFS' President

NACUFS℠
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

Office of the President
Kansas State University
Pittman Building
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
(913) 532-6453

February 9, 1987

Dear Foodservice Director:

The Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management and Dietetics at Kansas State University is presently engaged in a research project to study the role of managers in college and university foodservice. The NACUFS Executive Board believes that research in this area will provide valuable information for all member schools and therefore supports the project. Your participation is voluntary.

The NACUFS Executive Board encourages you and your management staff to participate.

Sincerely,

John T. Pence
President

jlf

APPENDIX F

Palacio Questionnaire Revisions for this Study

Table 16. Development of research questionnaire based on statements from the Palacio study

activity statements		change
Leader Role		
23.	Influencing the work performance of subordinates by organizing, structuring, directing, or rewarding work performed.	wording
30.	Selecting professional employees.	wording
32.	Selecting non-professional employees.	deleted
34.	Interviewing non-professional employees.	wording
36.	Conducting performance evaluations of professional staff.	deleted
38.	Training employees.	none
40.	Influencing employees in an informal manner (greeting employees, asking about work, complimenting achievement, and offering reassurance).	deleted
46.	Recruiting professional employees.	deleted
57.	Interviewing professional employees.	deleted
69.	Conducting performance evaluations of non-professional staff.	wording
75.	Recruiting non-professional employees.	wording
77.	Dismissing employees.	none
78.	Using formal authority to offer suggestions to subordinates.	none
79.	Reviewing performance evaluations conducted by other staff.	deleted

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
Spokesman		
2.	Giving talks to groups (professional organizations, trade associations, visiting groups, etc.) on subjects related to the organization's plans and programs.	none
8.	Speaking to visiting groups.	none
10.	Preparing written reports for superior's review.	deleted
31.	Speaking on topics within own area of professional expertise (media interviews, offering expert opinion to peers, etc.).	none
66.	Reporting to superiors and others on various ongoing programs (progress, concerns, etc.).	none
Initiator		
12.	Developing standards of quality for food and services provided.	deleted
13.	Initiating new projects for new directions activities for the department.	wording
15.	Improving quality to meet standards of quality for food and services provided.	deleted
18.	Solving long-term departmental/organizational problems.	none
19.	Specifying policies and procedures for compliance with relevant laws, regulations, and professional guidelines.	deleted
20.	Planning activities for performance improvement (new products, methods, new equipment, and other innovations).	wording

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
22.	Supervising the design phase of improvement projects.	none
37.	Soliciting funds to support projects.	deleted
42.	Identifying sources of funding to support new project.	deleted
45.	Engaging in applied research to study problems related to dietetic practice and the delivery of dietary department service.	deleted
59.	Maintaining standards of quality for food services provided.	wording
Figurehead		
24.	Attending social functions as a representative of the organization (retirement parties, employee social functions, weddings, etc.).	none
26.	Handling correspondence of social nature (letters of appreciation to retiring employees, signing diplomas, etc.).	wording
44.	Giving tours of department facilities to visiting groups.	none
60.	Attending community activities as a representative of the organization.	wording
73.	Using your title and prestige of your position to maintain client or customer relations.	deleted
80.	Signing contracts and official documents.	none

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
Disseminator		
3.	Notifying subordinates of conferences or workshops.	deleted
47.	Conveying information to subordinates received from staff or other line departments.	wording
49.	Sharing information received from outside contacts with subordinates (ideas, trade gossip, reports, etc.).	wording
50.	Passing on relevant reports and printed matter to subordinates.	none
61.	Communicating personnel preferences and opinions to subordinates to guide their decision making.	deleted
64.	Holding meetings with subordinates for the purpose of transmitting information.	wording
Resource Allocator		
1.	Scheduling own time-setting priorities.	deleted
4.	Approving proposals presented by subordinates after review.	wording
7.	Programming departmental work--deciding what's to be done, who will do it, what structure will be operative.	none
29.	Authorizing expenditures with budgetary constraints.	none
39.	Developing long range plans and priorities for the department.	none
43.	Recommends salary adjustments and salaries.	deleted

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
52.	Developing capital expenditures proposals.	deleted
53.	Preparing budgets for the department.	wording
Negotiator		
9.	Taking part in grievance procedures.	wording
25.	Negotiating with suppliers.	none
41.	Working with subordinates to reach mutual agreement.	wording
56.	Conferring with staff who are developing/ reviewing work standards.	none
62.	Approving policy exceptions.	deleted
65.	Participating in labor relations negotiations.	deleted
70.	Communicating with superiors to reach mutual agreement.	deleted
Liaison		
5.	Holding official positions in professional organizations.	deleted
11.	Working with groups and/or individuals within the organization but external to the department.	none
28.	Working with public service or charitable organizations.	none
33.	Serving as a consultant to groups and/or individuals both internal and external to the organization.	none

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
35.	Consulting with elected representatives about legislations affecting the professional organization.	none
58.	Attending professional conferences outside the organization for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a network of peers.	none
72.	Conferring with peers who work for other organizations.	deleted
74.	Keeping in touch with peers ("keeping the channels open").	none
Disturbance Handler		
14.	Working on problems with suppliers.	deleted
16.	Taking immediate charge when a major crisis develops in the department.	none
17.	Intervening in disagreements among subordinates when appropriate.	wording
51.	Making plans for corrective action due to pressures received from outside sources (labor unions, governmental agencies, customers, patients, etc.).	wording
55.	Handling client or customer complaints.	deleted
68.	Initiating corrective action on personnel problems.	none
76.	Solving problems in coordination with other departments in the organization.	deleted

Table 16. (cont.)

activity statements		change
Monitor		
6.	Attending conferences for the purpose of seeking and obtaining new ideas and monitoring trends.	deleted
21.	Receiving unsolicited internal information (gossip, rumors, information on events, etc.).	deleted
27.	Using operating reports to obtain information.	none
48.	Talking with subordinates to obtain information.	none
54.	Listening to unsolicited internal information (gossip, rumors, information on events, etc.).	none
63.	Making observations to obtain information.	none
67.	Reading information from outside contacts (suppliers, trade organizations, reading trade journals, etc.).	wording
71.	Reviewing client and customer surveys to obtain information.	none

APPENDIX G

Final Survey Instrument

KSU
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Dietetics, Restaurant and Institutional Management

Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5521

STUDY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICE MANAGERS

This study involves analysis of selected activities of college and university foodservice managers at various organizational levels and in different functional areas. Please rate each of the activities listed below for importance and time demand in relation to your present position.

On the IMPORTANCE SCALE (Scale A), circle the number indicating the value you place on the job functions in which you are actively engaged, individually or with others. How important are each of these activities to successful performance in your job? If you do not perform the activity or delegate a task almost completely to another staff member, circle 5, "Not part of my job" on the importance scale (Scale A).

On the TIME DEMAND SCALE (Scale B), circle the number indicating how frequently you perform each activity. If you do not perform the activity directly, circle 6 on the time demand scale (Scale B).

For the accuracy of the study, please provide responses on both scales for all statements.

Scale A: IMPORTANCE

In your present position, what is the relative importance of each of the activities?
(1) Essential
(2) Very important
(3) Fairly important
(4) Of minor importance
(5) Not part of my job or non-essential

Scale B: TIME DEMAND

How frequently do you perform each of the activities in your present position?
(1) Daily
(2) Weekly
(3) Once or twice a month
(4) Several times a year
(5) About once a year
(6) Not part of my job directly

ACTIVITY STATEMENTS	Scale A IMPORTANCE	Scale B TIME DEMAND
EXAMPLE: 1. Selecting professional employees.	(1) 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 (5) 6

Explanation: These responses indicate that you consider selecting professional employees as an essential aspect of your job but that you perform this activity only about once a year.

ACTIVITY STATEMENTS	Scale A IMPORTANCE	Scale B TIME DEMAND
1. Preparing operating and capital budgets for the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Negotiating with suppliers.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Developing long-range plans and priorities for the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Consulting with elected representatives about legislation affecting the professional organization.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Handling social correspondence (writing letters of appreciation to retiring employees, signing certificates, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Sharing information with subordinates from outside contacts (ideas, trade gossip, reports, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6

Scale A: IMPORTANCE

In your present position, what is the relative importance of each of the activities?

(1) Essential
(2) Very important
(3) Fairly important
(4) Of minor importance
(5) Not part of my job or non-essential

Scale B: TIME DEMAND

How frequently do you perform each of the activities in your present position?

(1) Daily
(2) Weekly
(3) Once or twice a month
(4) Several times a year
(5) About once a year
(6) Not part of my job directly

ACTIVITY STATEMENTS	Scale A IMPORTANCE	Scale B TIME DEMAND
7. Programming departmental work — deciding what's to be done, who will do it, what structure will be operative.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Representing the organization at community activities.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Recruiting employees.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Participating in grievance procedures.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Influencing work performance of subordinates by organizing, directing, or rewarding work performed.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Giving talks to groups (professional organizations, trade association visiting groups, etc.) on subjects related to the organization's plans and programs.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Listening to unsolicited internal information (gossip, rumors, information on events, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Receiving information from outside sources (suppliers, trade organizations, journals, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
15. Working with groups and/or individuals within the organization but external to the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Conferring with staff who are developing/reviewing work standards.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Using formal authority to offer suggestions to subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Giving tours of department facilities to visiting groups.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
19. Talking with subordinates to obtain information.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Approving proposals presented by subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Planning activities for performance improvement (new products, methods, equipment, and other innovations).	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
22. Holding meetings with subordinates for transmitting information.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
23. Attending social functions as a representative of the organization (retirement parties, employee social functions, weddings, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6

ACTIVITY STATEMENTS	Scale A IMPORTANCE	Scale B TIME DEMAND
24. Communicating with superiors and subordinates to reach mutual agreement.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
25. Keeping in touch with peers ("Keeping the channels open").	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
26. Training employees.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
27. Speaking on topics within own area of professional expertise (media interviews, offering expert opinion to peers, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
28. Maintaining standards of quality for food and services provided.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
29. Initiating corrective action on personnel problems.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
30. Conveying information to subordinates from staff or other departments.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
31. Conducting performance evaluations of staff.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
32. Making observations to obtain information.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
33. Reporting to superiors and others on various ongoing programs, (progress, concerns, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
34. Signing contracts and official documents.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
35. Supervising the design phase of improvement projects.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
36. Interviewing employees.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
37. Reviewing client and customer surveys to obtain information.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
38. Serving as a consultant to groups and/or individuals both internal and external to the organization.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
39. Initiating projects for new directions or activities for the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
40. Intervening in disagreements among subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
41. Making plans for corrective action due to pressures from outside sources (labor unions, governmental agencies, customers, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
42. Taking immediate charge when a major crisis develops in the department.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
43. Dismissing employees.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
44. Working with public service or charitable organizations.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
45. Passing on relevant reports and printed matter to subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
46. Using operating reports to obtain information.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
47. Solving long-term departmental/organizational problems.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6

(Please turn over to complete)

Scale A: IMPORTANCE

In your present position, what is the relative importance of each of the activities?
(1) Essential
(2) Very important
(3) Fairly important
(4) Of minor importance
(5) Not part of my job or non-essential

Scale B: TIME DEMAND

How frequently do you perform each of the activities in your present position?
(1) Daily
(2) Weekly
(3) Once or twice a month
(4) Several times a year
(5) About once a year
(6) Not part of my job directly

ACTIVITY STATEMENTS	Scale A IMPORTANCE	Scale B TIME DEMAND
48. Speaking to visiting groups.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
49. Attending professional conferences outside the organization for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a network of peers.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
50. Selecting employees.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6
51. Authorizing expenditures within budgetary constraints.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6

Part II: Demographic Information. Please provide the following information:

1. Please indicate:
   ____(1) Female
   ____(2) Male

2. Age:
   ____(1) 20-29
   ____(2) 30-39
   ____(3) 40-49
   ____(4) 50-59
   ____(5) 60 and over

3. Highest level of education:
   ____(1) High School
   ____(2) Bachelor's
   ____(3) Graduate work
   ____(4) Master's degree
   ____(5) Other; please specify
   _____

4. Are you a Registered Dietitian (R.D.)?
   ____(1) yes ____(2) no

5. Number of years in present organization:
   _____ years.

6. Indicate current employment status:
   ____(1) Employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week)
   ____(2) Employed full-time

7. Number of years in professional practice:
   _____ years.

8. What is your current position title?
   _____

9. What is the position title of the person you report to? _____

End of Questionnaire

Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX H

Letter to Directors Explaining Study
Correspondence Letters to Directors and Managers

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

February 9, 1987

Dear Director of Food Service,

Thank you for supplying information about the number of managers in your organization for the Kansas State University study entitled "Managerial Roles of College and University Food Service Managers."

The study will be limited to three groups of managers:

.Group 1 - Director and Associate/Assistant Director of Food Service

.Group 2 - Unit Managers of each dining facility

.Group 3 - Manager(s)/Supervisor(s) directly below unit manager in each facility

In a few days, you will receive a packet of materials which contains instructions, questionnaires, and return envelopes for the study. We are asking that you, as a food service director, distribute the questionnaires to your management staff.

This study has been endorsed by the NACUFS Board of Directors as indicated in the enclosed letter from NACUFS President, John Pence. The Board also has approved partial funding of the study.

Your help is greatly appreciated in completing this worthwhile research. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Mary Gregoire

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire, R.D. Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

February 16, 1987

Dear Director of Food Service,

We are in the final data collection stage of the Kansas State University (KSU) study entitled "Managerial Roles of College and University Food Service Managers." The research focuses on three groups of managers:

.Group 1-Director and Associate/Assistant Director of Food Service

.Group 2-Unit Managers of each dining facility

.Group 3-Manager(s)/Supervisor(s) directly below unit manager in each facility

We trust that you received our notice about the arrival of the enclosed packet of questionnaires. As director, we would like you to complete the following tasks to assist with the study:

1. Distribute the envelopes containing a questionnaire to each of your staff who have positions in management as defined above.

2. Complete one of the questionnaires yourself, and seal it in the white envelope.

3. Collect all the completed questionnaires, including your own, and return them to KSU in the large, brown, self-addressed, stamped envelope. This return method will ensure confidentiality of the individual responses but will permit economy in mailing costs.

4. Please enclose a copy of your organizational chart.

The questionnaires are labeled with an identification number to permit linking responses to the organization. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained. We would appreciate you returning yours and each staff member's completed questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by March 12, 1987.

Results of the study will be submitted for publication in the NACUFS Journal. Each participating college and university will receive a summary of the results. You and your staff's participation is greatly appreciated for this very worthwhile study. THANK YOU!

Sincerely,

Mary Gregoire

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire, R.D. Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Enclosures

1. White envelopes, questionnaires, and cover letters
2. Brown return envelope

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

February 16, 1987

Dear Director of Food Service,

We are in the final data collection stage of the Kansas State University (KSU) study entitled "Managerial Roles of College and University Food Service Managers." The research focuses on three groups of managers:

.Group 1-Director and Associate/Assistant Director of Food Service

.Group 2-Unit Managers of each dining facility

.Group 3-Manager(s)/Supervisor(s) directly below unit manager in each facility

We trust that you received our notice about the arrival of the enclosed packet of questionnaires. As director, we would like you to complete the following tasks to assist with the study:

1. Distribute the envelopes containing a questionnaire to each of your staff who have positions in management as defined above.

2. Complete one of the questionnaires yourself, and seal it in the white envelope.

3. Collect all the completed questionnaires, including your own, and return them to KSU in the large, brown, self-addressed, stamped envelope. This return method will ensure confidentiality of the individual responses but will permit economy in mailing costs.

The questionnaires are labeled with an identification number to permit linking responses to the organization. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained. We would appreciate you returning yours and each staff member's completed questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by March 12, 1987.

Results of the study will be submitted for publication in the NACUFS Journal. Each participating college and university will receive a summary of the results. You and your staff's participation is greatly appreciated for this very worthwhile study. THANK YOU!

Sincerely,

Mary Gregoire

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire, R.D. Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Enclosures

1. White envelopes, questionnaires, and cover letters
2. Brown return envelope

(KSU LETTERHEAD)

February 16, 1987

Dear University Food Service Manager,

At Kansas State University, we are currently engaged in a research project to study the roles of managers such as yourself who are working in college and university food service management. The study has been endorsed and partially funded by the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS).

Your participation in this study is vital to its success. We would greatly appreciate if you would assist us with the following:

(1) Complete the enclosed questionnaire.

(2) Place your completed questionnaire back into the envelope and seal it.

(3) Return the sealed envelope containing your questionnaire to your food service director by March 9, 1987.

Questionnaires are labeled with an identification number to permit linking responses to the organization. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained.

Your time and help in this worthwhile study are greatly appreciated. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Paige Mitchell

Paige Mitchell, R.D.
Administrative Dietitian

Mary Gregoire

Mary Gregoire, R.D. Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

APPENDIX I

Position Titles of College and University Foodservice Managers

Position titles of college and university foodservice managers

Group 1

Associate Foodservice Director
Assistant Foodservice Director
Director of Foodservice
Senior Director
Executive Director-Auxiliary Services
Administrative Supervisor
Administrative Assistant
Foodservice Administrator
Director of Contract Dining
Director of Residential Life
Dining Service Administrator
Administrative Dietitian
Assistant to Vice Chancellor
Manager of Foodservice
Assistant Housing Director
Foodservice Coordinator
Operations Manager

Group 2

Unit Manager
Manager of Foodservice
Assistant Manager
Satellite Operation Manager
Procurement Manager
Operations Manager
Catering Manager
Chef
Cash Operations Director
Production Manager
Food and Beverage Manager
Support Services Manager
Supervisor
Executive Chef
Division Manager
Cafeteria Manager
General Manager
Dietitian
Foodservice Administrator
Assistant Foodservice Director
Dining Hall Manager

Position titles of college and university foodservice managers (cont.)

Group 3

Production Manager

Production Manager/Supervisor

Campus Store Supervisor

Foodservice Supervisor

Operations Supervisor

Assistant Catering Manager

Assistant Food Production Manager

Cash Operation Production Manager

Assistant Supervisor

Foodservice Operations Supervisor

Cook 3

Assistant Foodservice Manager

General Manager

Executive Chef

Assistant Director

Coordinator of Foodservice

Dining Services Support Manager

Operations Manager

Student Personnel Supervisor

Service Supervisor

Service Area Manager

Foodservice Manager

Catering Supervisor

Cafeteria Supervisor

Chef

Commissary Coordinator

Procurement Manager

Nutritionist/Foodservice Staff Supervisor

Administrative Dietitian

Administrative Manager/ Supervisor

Computer Operations Manager

Marketing and Nutritional Services

Maintenance/Custodial Supervisor

APPENDIX J

Supplemental Tables

Table 17. Group 1 college and university foodservice manager[1] ratings on importance of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
essential (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.79	± .60
22	holding informational meetings	4.57	± .67
24	communicating with superiors and subordinates	4.57	± .62
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	4.54	± .84
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	4.54	± .70
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.50	± .73
very important (3.5 to 4.49)			
19	obtaining information from subordinates	4.49	± .67
32	making observations to obtain information	4.43	± .73
33	reporting to superiors	4.40	± .73
3	developing long-range plans	4.37	± .90
31	conducting performance evaluation of staff	4.36	± .86
30	conveying information to subordinates	4.30	± .71
47	solving long-term problems	4.30	± .91
7	programming departmental work	4.30	± .85

[1]Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127.

[2]Scale = 1, not part of my job or non-essential, to 5, essential.

Table 17. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
very important (3.5 to 4.49) (cont.)			
25	keeping in touch with peers	4.28	± .82
51	authorizing expenditures	4.26	±1.00
29	taking corrective action on personnel problems	4.22	± .90
21	planning for performance improvement	4.18	± .75
39	initiating projects	4.17	± .89
50	selecting employees	4.13	±1.14
1	preparing budgets	4.13	±1.41
26	training employees	4.12	±1.11
20	approving proposals	4.12	± .82
16	conferring with staff on work standards	4.03	± .82
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.03	± .94
15	working with other departments	3.92	± .88
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	3.84	± .90
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	3.79	± .95
49	attending professional conferences	3.78	± .89
14	reading information from outside contacts	3.75	± .88
36	interviewing employees	3.69	±1.21
35	supervising the design of improvement projects	3.65	±1.35

Table 17. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
very important (3.5 to 4.49) (cont.)			
9	recruiting employees	3.64	±1.32
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	3.62	±1.24
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.61	± .90
37	reviewing client surveys	3.60	±1.12
43	dismissing employees	3.53	±1.28
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49)			
10	participating in grievance procedures	3.42	±1.20
13	listening to unsolicited internal information	3.23	±1.04
34	signing legal and official documents	3.21	±1.42
2	negotiating with suppliers	3.01	±1.51
5	handling social correspondence	2.97	±1.25
23	representing the organization at community events	2.87	±1.09
27	speaking in area of professional expertise	2.85	±1.03
8	representing the organization at community events	2.80	±1.13
12	giving talks to groups	2.69	±1.07
48	speaking to visiting groups	2.68	± .99
38	serving as a consultant	2.61	±1.10
44	working with community organizations	2.59	±1.14

Table 17. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49) (cont.)			
18	giving department tours	2.58	± .94
minor importance (< 2.5)			
4	consulting with legislators	1.93	±1.12

Table 18. Group 2 college and university foodservice manager[1] ratings on importance of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
essential (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.85	± .61
11	influencing work performance by subordinates	4.61	± .79
26	training employees	4.57	± .85
29	initiating corrective action on personnel problems	4.50	± .77
very important (3.5 to 4.49)			
24	working with employees to reach mutual agreement	4.45	± .84
22	holding informational meetings	4.43	± .79
32	making observations to obtain information	4.40	± .74
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	4.37	±1.15
30	conveying information to subordinates	4.35	± .82
31	conducting performance evaluations of staff	4.34	± .87
25	keeping in touch with peers	4.34	± .82
19	obtaining information from subordinates	4.33	± .95
50	selecting employees	4.25	±1.12
33	reporting to superiors	4.18	± .78

[1]Group 2 (unit managers) N = 368-379.

[2]Scale = 1, not part of my job or non-essential, to 5, essential.

Table 18. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
very important (3.5 to 4.49) (cont.)			
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.12	±1.17
7	programming departmental work	4.11	±1.32
36	interviewing employees	4.00	±1.19
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	3.97	±1.01
21	planning for performance	3.93	±1.11
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	3.86	±1.03
16	conferring with staff on work standards	3.79	±1.17
43	dismissing employees	3.76	±1.33
20	approving proposals	3.75	±1.13
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.74	±1.05
37	reviewing client surveys	3.60	±1.30
3	developing long-range plans	3.56	±1.43
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49)			
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	3.43	±1.17
14	reading information from outside contacts	3.41	±1.06
47	solving long-term problems	3.36	±1.50
15	working with other departments	3.34	±1.24
39	initiating projects	3.34	±1.31

Table 18. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49) (cont.)			
49	attending professional conferences	3.33	±1.21
51	authorizing expenditures	3.27	±1.69
13	listening to unsolicited information	3.25	±1.15
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	3.23	±1.46
9	recruiting employees	3.23	±1.57
10	participating in grievance procedures	3.10	±1.42
1	preparing budgets	2.94	±1.78
23	representing the organization at social functions	2.75	±1.20
35	supervising the design of improvement projects	2.75	±1.20
27	speaking in area of professional expertise	2.56	±1.33
minor importance (< 2.5)			
18	giving department tours	2.48	±1.18
5	handling social correspondence	2.38	±1.35
34	signing legal and official documents	2.37	±1.58
2	negotiating with suppliers	2.32	±1.56
38	serving as a consultant	2.27	±1.35
8	representing the organization at community events	2.25	±1.30
48	speaking to visiting groups	2.19	±1.24

Table 18. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
minor importance (< 2.5) (cont.)			
44	working with community organizations	2.15	±1.34
12	giving talks to groups	2.00	±1.24
4	consulting with legislators	1.58	±1.14

Table 19. Group 3 college and university foodservice manager[1] ratings on importance of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
essential (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	4.87	± .50
26	training employees	4.65	± .74
very important (3.5 to 4.49)			
25	keeping in touch with peers	4.46	± .87
11	supervising subordinates	4.43	± .96
24	working with employees to reach agreement	4.41	± .90
32	making observations to obtain information	4.36	± .89
30	conveying information to subordinates	4.32	± .93
29	taking corrective action on personnel problems	4.28	± .99
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	4.26	±1.24
19	obtaining information from subordinates	4.22	± .97
33	reporting to superiors	4.09	±1.03
22	holding informational meetings	4.04	±1.15
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	3.92	±1.11
31	conducting performance evaluations of staff	3.88	±1.34

[1]Group 3 = manager responsible to unit manager N = 472-492.

[2]Scale = 1, not part of my job or non-essential, to 5, essential.

Table 19. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
very important (3.5 to 4.49) (cont.)			
7	programming departmental work	3.79	±1.47
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	3.65	±1.22
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.64	±1.21
46	obtaining information from operating reports	3.54	±1.45
21	planning for performance improvement	3.51	±1.33
16	conferring with staff on work standards	3.50	±1.33
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49)			
50	selecting employees	3.36	±1.64
13	listening to unsolicited internal information	3.33	±1.14
20	approving proposals	3.22	±1.33
36	interviewing employees	3.20	±1.62
15	working with other departments	3.08	±1.38
14	reading information from outside contacts	3.05	±1.23
37	reviewing client surveys	3.02	±1.54
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	2.92	±1.27
43	dismissing employees	2.88	±1.56
39	initiating projects	2.82	±1.43
3	developing long-range plans	2.79	±1.54

Table 19. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
fairly important (2.5 to 3.49) (cont.)			
9	recruiting employees	2.76	±1.66
49	attending professional conferences	2.76	±1.39
47	solving long-term problems	2.71	±1.55
10	participating in grievance procedures	2.61	±1.47
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	2.57	±1.59
minor importance (< 2.5)			
23	representing the organization at social functions	2.41	±1.25
27	speaking in area of expertise	2.30	±1.40
18	giving department tours	2.24	±1.18
2	negotiating with suppliers	2.24	±1.54
35	supervising the design of improvement projects	2.14	±1.42
51	authorizing expenditures	2.10	±1.58
38	serving as a consultant	1.96	±1.33
48	speaking to visiting groups	1.87	±1.21
1	preparing budgets	1.87	±1.50
8	representing the organization at community events	1.84	±1.16
44	working with community organizations	1.81	±1.20
34	signing legal and official documents	1.80	±1.34
5	handling social correspondence	1.74	±1.12

Table 19. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
minor importance (< 2.5)			
12	giving talks to groups	1.62	±1.07
4	consulting with legislators	1.47	±1.05

Table 20. Group 1 college university foodservice manager[1] ratings on time demand of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
weekly or more (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.54	±1.06
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.52	± .78
32	making observations to obtain information	5.36	± .94
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.10	±1.16
24	communicating with superiors and subordinates	5.10	± .97
30	conveying information to subordinates	4.93	± .88
22	holding informational meetings	4.93	± .88
25	keeping in touch with peers	4.82	±1.04
7	programming departmental work	4.82	±1.14
33	reporting to superiors	4.80	± .83
14	reading information from outside contacts	4.74	± .99
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.73	± .95
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.73	± .84
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.69	± .95

[1]Group 1 (assoc./asst. and foodservice directors) N = 126-127.

[2]Scale 1, not part of my job directly, to 6, daily.

Table 20. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49)			
15	working with other departments	4.68	±1.12
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	4.52	±1.04
20	approving proposals	4.46	± .98
51	authorizing expenditures	4.45	±1.43
21	planning for performance improvement	4.27	± .95
13	listening to unsolicited internal information	4.16	±1.52
16	conferring with staff on work standards	4.10	±1.04
29	taking corrective action on personnel problems	3.89	±1.30
26	negotiating with suppliers	3.67	±1.12
3	developing long-range plans	3.67	±1.12
34	signing legal and official documents	3.62	±1.87
47	solving long-term problems	3.58	±1.14
39	initiating projects	3.57	±1.03
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49)			
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.09	±1.01
37	reviewing client surveys	3.07	±1.09
23	representing the organization	2.99	± .95
36	interviewing employees	2.96	±1.03
5	handling social correspondence	2.94	±1.30

Table 20. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49) (cont.)			
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	2.94	±1.23
35	supervising the design of improvement project	2.92	±1.31
49	attending professional conferences	2.90	± .58
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	2.88	±1.19
27	speaking in area of professional expertise	2.87	±1.12
8	representing the organization	2.86	±1.18
9	recruiting employees	2.85	±1.19
50	selecting employees	2.80	± .93
18	giving department tours	2.74	± .87
2	negotiating with suppliers	2.73	±1.66
10	participating in grievance procedures	2.63	±1.11
31	conducting performance evaluations of staff	2.63	± .78
1	preparing budgets	2.60	±1.16
38	serving as a consultant	2.54	±1.09
about one time/year (< 2.5)			
48	speaking to visiting groups	2.49	± .90
12	giving talks to group	2.46	± .97
44	working with community organizations	2.40	±1.19

Table 20. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
about one time/year (< 2.5) (cont.)			
43	dismissing employees	2.15	± .81
4	consulting with legislators	1.50	± .85

Table 21. Group 2 college and university foodservice manager[1] ratings on time demand of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
weekly or more (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.81	± .72
32	making observations to obtain information	5.41	±1.02
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.37	±1.12
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.36	±1.16
25	keeping in touch with peers	5.12	±1.03
30	conveying information to subordinates	5.04	± .91
24	working with employees to reach agreement	4.95	±1.16
26	training employees	4.83	±1.38
33	reporting to superiors	4.78	± .95
22	holding informational meetings	4.72	± .92
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.69	±1.37
29	taking corrective action on personnel problems	4.63	±1.32
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.58	±1.75
7	programming departmental work	4.58	±1.24

[1]Group 2 (unit managers) N = 368-379.

[2]Scale = 1, not part of my job directly, to 6, daily.

Table 21. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49)			
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.49	±1.40
13	listening to unsolicited internal information	4.18	±1.84
14	reading information from outside contacts	4.12	±1.30
20	approving proposals	4.09	±1.47
21	planning for performance improvement	4.04	±1.37
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	3.97	±1.51
15	working with other departments	3.82	±1.60
16	conferring with staff on work standards	3.78	±1.51
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.52	±1.27
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49)			
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situation	3.45	±1.64
51	authorizing expenditures	3.18	±1.91
37	reviewing client surveys	3.17	±1.48
36	interviewing employees	3.10	±1.20
50	selecting employees	2.99	±1.16
39	initiating projects	2.91	±1.28
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	2.84	±1.56

Table 21. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49) (cont.)			
31	conducting performance evaluations of staff	2.82	±1.04
47	solving long-term problems	2.81	±1.42
3	developing long-range plans	2.79	±1.34
9	recruiting employees	2.64	±1.39
23	representing the organization at social functions	2.53	±1.04
about one time/year (< 2.5)			
27	speaking in area of professional expertise	2.45	±1.48
34	signing legal and official documents	2.44	±1.88
49	attending professional conferences	2.44	± .88
18	giving department tours	2.43	±1.15
43	dismissing employees	2.33	±1.04
10	participating in grievance procedures	2.26	±1.22
2	negotiating with suppliers	2.18	±1.72
5	handling social correspondence	2.18	±1.25
38	serving as a consultant	2.13	±1.42
35	supervising the design of improvement projects	2.12	±1.29
8	representing the organization at community events	2.05	±1.28
44	working with community organization	1.88	±1.21

Table 21. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
about one time/year (< 2.5) (cont.)			
1	preparing budgets	1.87	±1.13
48	speaking to visiting groups	1.85	±1.04
12	giving department tours	1.69	±1.02
4	consulting with legislators	1.27	± .82

Table 22. Group 3 college and university foodservice manager[1] ratings on time demand of activity statements

activity no.	statement	mean[2]	std. dev.
weekly or more (4.5+)			
28	maintaining standards of quality	5.87	± .62
11	influencing work performance of subordinates	5.37	±1.26
19	obtaining information from subordinates	5.34	±1.14
32	making observations to obtain information	5.30	±1.24
25	keeping in touch with peers	5.28	±1.16
30	conveying information to subordinates	5.11	±1.18
26	training employees	5.09	±1.28
24	working with employees to reach agreement	5.02	±1.28
17	using formal authority to offer suggestions	4.92	±1.43
33	reporting to superiors	4.70	±1.40
29	taking corrective action to reach agreement	4.63	±1.44
once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49)			
7	programming departmental work	4.41	±1.97
22	holding informational meetings	4.26	±1.42

[1]Group 3 (manager responsible to unit manager) N = 472-492.

[2]Scale = 1, not part of my job directly, to 6, daily.

Table 22. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
once or twice/month (3.5 to 4.49) (cont.)			
13	listening to unsolicited internal information	4.17	±1.92
45	passing on printed information to subordinates	4.10	±1.57
46	obtaining information from operating reports	4.00	±1.86
42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations	3.83	±1.70
20	approving proposals	3.68	±1.76
40	intervening in subordinate disagreements	3.64	±1.49
14	reading information from outside contacts	3.62	±1.56
16	conferring with staff on work standards	3.60	±1.64
21	planning for performance improvement	3.53	±1.61
15	working with other departments	3.51	±1.82
several times/year (2.5 to 3.49)			
6	sharing outside information with subordinates	3.49	±1.68
37	reviewing client surveys	2.86	±1.71
31	conducting performance evaluations on staff	2.80	±1.25
50	selecting employees	2.66	±1.46
36	interviewing employees	2.65	±1.51
39	initiating projects	2.53	±1.42

Table 22. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
about once/year (< 2.5)			
9	recruiting employees	2.40	±1.57
3	developing long-range plans	2.39	±1.42
41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures	2.36	±1.65
47	solving long-term problems	2.35	±1.53
2	negotiating with suppliers	2.29	±1.89
27	speaking in area of professional expertise	2.20	±1.56
23	representing the organization at social functions	2.18	±1.07
18	giving department tours	2.04	±1.06
10	participating in grievance procedures	2.03	±1.31
43	dismissing employees	2.03	±1.17
49	selecting employees	2.00	± .94
51	authorizing expenditures	1.94	±1.71
35	supervising the design of improvement projects	1.90	±1.36
38	serving as a consultant	1.80	±1.36
34	signing legal and official documents	1.76	±1.53
8	representing the organization at community events	1.69	±1.11
44	working with community organizations	1.58	±1.12
5	handling social correspondence	1.56	± .99

Table 22. (cont.)

activity no.	statement	mean	std. dev.
about once/year (< 2.5)			
48	speaking to visiting groups	1.55	± .91
12	giving talks to groups	1.38	± .80
1	preparing budgets	1.36	± .91
4	consulting with legislators	1.18	± .60

Table 23. Questionnaire activity statements categorized into Mintzberg's[1] managerial roles

role	statement no.	activity statement
interpersonal		
figurehead	5	handling social correspondence
	8	representing the organization at community events
	18	giving department tours
	23	representing the organization at social functions
	34	signing legal and official documents
leader	9	recruiting employees
	11	supervising subordinates work
	17	using formal authority to offer suggestions
	26	training employees
	31	conducting performance evaluations of staff
	36	interviewing employees
	43	dismissing employees
	50	selecting employees
liaison	4	consulting with legislators
	15	working with other departments
	25	keeping in touch with peers
	38	serving as a consultant

[1]Mintzberg (34-36).

Table 23. (cont.)

role	statement no.	activity statement
liaison (cont.)	44	working with community organizations
	49	attending professional conferences
informational		
disseminator	6	sharing outside information with subordinates
	22	holding informational meetings
	30	conveying information to subordinates
	45	passing on printed information to subordinates
monitor	13	listening to unsolicited internal information
	14	reading information from outside contacts
	19	obtaining information from subordinates
	32	making observations to obtain information
	37	reviewing client surveys
	46	obtaining information from operating reports
spokesman	12	giving talks to groups
	27	speaking in area of professional expertise
	33	reporting to superiors
	48	speaking to visiting groups

Table 23. (cont.)

role	statement no.	activity statement
decisional		
disturbance handler	29	taking corrective action on personnal problems
	40	intervening in subordinate disagreements
	41	planning for corrective action due to outside pressures
	42	taking immediate charge in crisis situations
initiator	21	planning for performance improvement
	28	maintaining standards of quality
	35	supervising the design of improvement projects
	39	initiating projects
	47	solving long-term problems
negotiator	2	negotiating with suppliers
	10	participating in grievance procedures
	16	conferring with staff on work standards
	24	working with employees to reach agreement
resource allocator	1	preparing budgets
	3	developing long-range plans
	7	programming departmental work

Table 23. (cont.)

role	statement no.	activity statement
resource allocator (cont.)	20	approving proposals
	51	authorizing expenditures

MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOODSERVICE MANAGERS

by

PAIGE MITCHELL SULTEMEIER

B.S., Texas Tech University, 1983

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management, and Dietetics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1988

ABSTRACT

College and university foodservice directors are faced with decreasing student enrollments, noncompulsory meal and housing plans, and increasing competition. Competent managers are necessary to ensure resources are used effectively and efficiently.

The purpose of the study was to examine managerial roles in college and university foodservice at three organizational levels. Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles provided the basis for development of the research instrument in which respondents rated the 51 activity statements on importance and time demand.

The population for the study was comprised of foodservice managers at National Association of College and University Food Service (NACUFS) member schools with a minimum annual budget of $3 million. Roles of three groups of managers were studied: Group 1, associate/assistant and foodservice director, Group 2, unit manager, and Group 3, managers responsible to unit managers. A total of 999 managers from 80 colleges and universities participated in the study.

Group 1 managers tended to rate activity statements highest for both importance and time demand; whereas Group 3 managers usually provided the lowest ratings. The majority of activities rated as most time demanding by all three groups of college and university managers in this study also were rated as essential for importance. Maintaining standards of quality was rated as most essential and time demanding by all managers.

Activity statements were categorized into Mintzberg's 10 managerial roles. Ten role scores for importance and 10 for time demand resulted. Reliability of the scales was checked using coefficient alpha.

Correlation of importance and time demand role scores were computed. Correlations between each managerial importance role score and its related time demand score were found to be moderately correlated for all ten roles.

Significant differences in importance and time demand ratings between the three managerial groups were indicated for all ten roles. The perceived importance and time demand of roles tended to increase as managerial level increased with two exceptions. Group 2 and 3 managers rated the disturbance handler role more time consuming than Group 1 managers and Group 2 managers also rated the leader role as more time demanding than did mangers in Group 1.

Education level was found to significantly affect importance ratings for three of the 10 roles: monitor, negotiator, and disturbance handler. Ratings of roles on the time demand scale differed based on education for the three informational roles and the negotiator role. Those with a master's degree rated all three of the informational roles as more time demanding than those with a high school education.